

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

Tuesday, March 3, 2026

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

Patrick Tripeny

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director

Justice Tuffour, City Planner

WORK SESSION

Chair Dennis Roach called the Work Session to order at 5:30 p.m. He noted that all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Brian Berndt. There were three Public Hearing items on the Regular Meeting agenda. The first was the continued discussion of the “Bowthorpe House.” The second Public Hearing item is a Partial Vacation of a Public Street, and the third item relates to the Preliminary Plan for “Royal Holladay Hills, Block H, I, and J.”

City Planner, Carrie Marsh, shared information about the “Bowthorpe House” Historic Site Conditional Land Use Permit agenda item. She reported that there will be a presentation during the Regular Meeting. The applicant submitted some additional materials, including a document that outlines some of the construction details. There is information about the improvements that were made to the exterior as well as information about the interior work. Ms. Marsh further reviewed the additionally submitted documents that the applicant will share during the meeting.

Chair Roach noted that at the last meeting, there was a discussion about what makes this house historic. Ms. March explained that there will be two separate motions made. The first will be for the site modifications, and the second will be for the office use. It was noted that there is an error in the Staff Report. One of the motions will be for a Conditional Use for a Proposed Use. Commissioner Paul Cunningham suggested that the Planning Commission consider a motion on the use first. He noted that there can be a motion made on the modification after that vote.

Chair Roach believed the reason the historic component needs to be resolved first is that if it does not meet the qualifications for a historic property, then the use cannot be a home office in this zone. Ms. Marsh explained that if there are conditions being placed on the Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) related to modifications to the property, the conditions in the use would refer back to the conditions in the site modification. Chair Roach stated that the use and site modification items essentially go hand in hand. There was additional discussion about the two motions.

Chair Roach asked if it would be possible to have a rental and a home business in the zone with CUP approval, regardless of historic status. Ms. Marsh confirmed this. Commissioner Karianne Prince pointed out that this property is not owner-occupied, which limits some of the allowed uses. Ms. Marsh explained that there are additional uses allowed for historic sites. It does not have to be owner-occupied when there is a historic site. If a recommendation is made to have the property removed from the historic list, then this item would move to the City Council. If it is no longer considered a historic property, any of the granted approvals would be nullified. The applicant could then return to the Planning Commission to pursue uses conditional in the R-2 Zone.

Commissioner Patrick Tripeny mentioned the tree that was on the property in 1972. He asked if a tree is considered to be historic. The Commission could simply state that any tree that is removed needs to be replaced. Ms. Marsh explained that this was specifically noted in the historic property designation file. It was part of the record that outlined what made the site historic. The Planning Commission can discuss whether this needs to be preserved on the property moving forward.

Chair Roach explained that when he was reading through the historic application, it specifically called out that tree as part of the historic nature of the site. He understands that some of the modifications do not match what was originally on the site, such as the porch, but some of that could be made up with the tree. There can be additional discussion during the Regular Meeting.

Commissioner Angela Gong noted that she missed the last discussion on this item because she was out of town. She wanted to know if the question is whether the modifications made would remove this property from the historic register. Ms. Marsh reported that there was discussion about whether the modifications had altered the historic nature of the site. Chair Roach added that there was some public comment about that at the last Planning Commission Meeting as well.

Ms. Marsh reported that she received a public comment about this Public Hearing item. The person who provided the comment submitted his address after the fact, so that is included in the record. Chair Roach asked that the comment be summarized for the record during the Public Hearing.

City Planner, Justice Tuffour, discussed the Public Hearing item related to a Partial Vacation of a Public Street. The location is 2755 East Hillsden Drive and the applicants are seeking to vacate a portion of the unused public right-of-way that is adjacent to their property on the west side. If the application is approved, the subject area would be deeded to the applicant. The Technical Review Committee ("TRC") and City Staff have provided a report and recommendations. Chair Roach believed the request is for the City to vacate a portion of the property, which was confirmed. Mr. Tuffour shared an image with the Planning Commission to indicate the current site conditions.

Chair Roach noted that most would assume this is already the property of the applicant based on the street view, which shows there is a wall and landscaping on the site. He asked for background information about the property. Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, did not know when the wall was built, but some assumptions have been made.

Commissioner Gong noted that the owner to the north appears to be in a similar situation. Mr. Tuffour explained that in the General Plan, a public street is classified as a secondary residential street. In the General Plan, secondary residential streets have a width of 20 to 50 feet.

The public right-of-way is estimated to be between 66 and 70 feet, so there is enough room for the vacation.

The third Public Hearing item was discussed, which is a Preliminary Plan for “Royal Holladay Hills, Block H, I, and J.” Mr. Teerlink reported that these blocks are core lots within the site. The Commission is primarily reviewing the site development, which is based on 13.65 of the Regional/Mixed-Use (“R/M-U”) Zone, the civil site details that are required in 13.08, and architectural compatibility with the Site Development Master Plan (“SDMP”). The Planning Commission has been provided with information to review, but there have been updates made to some of the building architecture styles. This will be reviewed in more detail during the Regular Meeting, as it was not included in the Meeting Materials Packet. He explained that the applicant provided additional exterior renderings after the Meeting Materials Packet was distributed.

Mr. Teerlink reported that the Planning Commission is requested to review the Preliminary Site Plan, which includes compliance with the SDMP. In the past, there was a three-step process, which included Concept, Preliminary, and Final. The Planning Commission now only needs to handle the Preliminary review. Staff handles the Concept review and also finalizes any civil and engineering details at the final stage. Chair Roach asked about Block J and noted that there was a mention made to “future development.” He wanted to know if it is normal to have a concept that is still lacking in detail. Mr. Teerlink confirmed this. He noted that when Block C was reviewed, none of the pads in the block were formalized. Chair Roach thanked him for the clarification.

Commissioner Prince stated that the Planning Commission has approved Block E, but asked if Block F has been considered. This was denied. Mr. Teerlink reported that Block E was seen previously, but that has been revised and will return to the Commission at some point in the future.

Chair Roach closed the Work Session at 5:56 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 Berndt. There are three Public Hearing items on the Regular Meeting agenda. The Opening Statement was read aloud by Commissioner Gong.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **“Bowthorpe House” – Historic Site Conditional Land Use Permit – 4910 South Holladay Boulevard (R-2-10) - Continued Review and Consideration of a Request by the Property Owner, for Modifications to and Additional Land Use for this Historic Site. Item Reviewed as Conditional Use as per Provisions stated in Holladay Ordinance §13.86.030 and §13.08.040. File #26-02-01.**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that this item relates to “Bowthorpe House,” which is located at 4910 South Holladay Boulevard in the R-2-10 Zone. She explained that this is a CUP that is separated into two. For one, the Planning Commission is asked to look at modifications to a historic site, while the other looks at a proposed use for a historic site. There is a list of Additional Uses For Historic Sites included in the Staff Report. The applicant is proposing a residential unit and office. Both residential units and offices are included on the list.

Ms. Marsh discussed Modifications, which are defined in 13.86.065. She explained that the property was modified recently by the property owner, as the previous property owner did not maintain the property to the standards in the code. The current property owner made certain modifications, such as removing paint from the brick and adding siding to the outside of the brick. In addition, there were changes made to the windows. There was an adobe wall that was on the front side of the house, but there was water damage from a porch that was added much later. That caused a lot of failure in the adobe structure, so the property owner had to remedy that by adding some additional foundation and footings. There was also replacement of the front wall.

Bricks were damaged, and the property owner did not wish to replace individual bricks. The property owner decided to place siding on the outside instead. Siding was used that had a historic look and is what would have been used in the 1800s. Ms. Marsh shared background information about the historic nature of the house. It is listed on the Century Register, and it was listed in 1972. She explained that the Century Register is an honorary list that designates pioneer homes built before 1900. This list has no benefits or restrictions associated with it, but does recognize something as a historic site. It was noted that William Bowthorpe was a property owner who was engaged in farming and provided some local produce to nearby residents at the time.

The Staff Report includes additional details from a Reconnaissance Survey. In the 1990s, the County did a survey of all properties within a specific area and this property was recommended to be included on the National Historic Registry. However, it is not included on the National Historic Registry at this time, despite being mentioned as a notable site. Ms. Marsh reported that this is an example of a cross-wing type cottage that was prevalent in the late 1800s to early 1900s. It also has subtle Victorian Eclectic features on the window treatments and gable-end ornamentation.

The Staff Report details some of the modifications made by the applicant. Ms. Marsh reported that the applicant will share presentation slides with the Planning Commission during the meeting to detail some of those elements. There are suggested Conditions of Approval and Findings included in the Staff Report for both of the motions, which include the use and modifications.

Chair Roach asked if there is a recommendation that the national historic registry component be completed by the applicant. Ms. Marsh denied this. She explained that it comes down to whether or not the property owner wants to seek out that designation. Those kinds of applications are normally instigated by the property owner. She shared information about the current designation process in Holladay and stated that it involves a property meeting one of three elements.

At the last meeting, there was a discussion about whether or not this property should be included on the historic list. Ms. Marsh suggested that the Planning Commission look at what the code outlines as far as what is required for a site to be on the list. She pointed out that someone notable in Holladay can be considered, and Mr. Bowthorpe would likely meet that qualification.

Chair Roach asked if this is already marked as a historic site by Holladay. Ms. Marsh confirmed this and explained that it is included in the designated properties as a historic site. It is also on the Century Register. There are seven historic properties in the City of Holladay, and this is one of them.

The applicant, Hillary Taylor, introduced herself to the Planning Commission. At the last meeting, she informed the Commission that she did everything possible to restore the home. The two walls that she encased are still there, the house is still there, and the roofline is still there. The adobe walls mentioned are still there and are protected and held up with additional framing, footings, foundation, and steel. The misty blue spruce was dead and also posed an imminent threat to the building. It would have cost a lot less to tear down the house and build something else, but her intention was to preserve the historic nature of the site as much as possible. Ms. Taylor reminded Commissioners that the property was in a dilapidated state previously and she chose to clean it up.

Ms. Taylor reported that when Hazel Bowthorpe described the house, it was noted that it had a rock foundation. She shared presentation slides with those present and explained that the left image shows that the rock foundation is still visible. Additional information was shared about the historic elements remaining on the site. The gingerbread trim mentioned by Ms. Bowthorpe remains. There was a picket fence mentioned, but she is unsure where that was located. Mr. Taylor put in a new arbor because there was one that was falling over on the property. The shingles that had been on the east-facing elevation were added to the later addition. As for the misty blue spruce, which was originally referred to as a mystic blue spruce, this is something she would like to plant somewhere on the property. Several images were shared with the Commission.

Ms. Taylor believed that the Bowthorpe family intended for the home to be decorative, which is seen in the gingerbread trim, shingles, and the items on the exterior side that were there when she purchased the home. She shared images of the base trim located in the front three rooms. Ms. Taylor explained that this was more than a pioneer farm home, but a highly decorated house.

Ms. Taylor reiterated that the two walls that had exposed brick had been painted and were damaged. She called in experts and ultimately had to determine how best to move forward. It was noted that there are some elements of this home that are Victorian. She provided information about additions that have been added over the years and reviewed an image of the back of the house.

The presentation slides highlighted the damage that had been done. Ms. Taylor reported that all of the ivy caused extreme damage to the brick, as did the paint that was used. The paint was dark, and it pulled all of the moisture out, which left the brick brittle. There was a lot that needed to be done on the home to address the existing damage. Photographs of the brick damage were shared.

Ms. Taylor next discussed the 1980s vinyl window that was there, which was not original to the home. The submitted materials describe the windows on the home. She reminded Commissioners that the historic house is still standing. She has done nothing to change the landscape other than clean it up, put in a walkway for safety, and change the door on the front gate. It is upsetting that there have been comments made about potentially removing this site from the historic register. She explained that there has been a lot of thought and care put into this historic property.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing.

There was an email comment submitted to the Planning Commission ahead of the meeting. Ms. Marsh summarized the contents of the email for the record. The comment was from Ron Hilton at 2397 East Murray Holladay Road. Mr. Hilton outlined several sections of code and the requirements. The comment states that there is value in the historic site itself. Many of the changes

made are preservationist in nature, but might not meet the strictest professional standards. He noted that the modifications, while not completely original, could still fit the historic nature.

Ashley Park gave her address as 2878 East Heather Circle and expressed support for the applicant. She was the real estate agent when Ms. Taylor purchased this property. This property has been listed seven times since 1998, and not one time was it ever listed as a historic property. From 2017 to 2022, a rental property agency owned the home. When Ms. Taylor purchased the home, it was completely dilapidated, and she expressed a desire to bring it back to life. The current property owner did not have any knowledge of this being a historic home at the time of purchase. Ms. Park pointed out that the property has been dramatically improved since the time of purchase.

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

Chair Roach stated that much of the original house is still there, and he believes this should still be considered a historic property. Commissioner Gong agreed. It is clear that the intention was to restore the home as much as possible. The research the applicant has done shows that the goal was always to respect the original design. There is a clear level of respect for the history of the property.

Commissioner Jill Fonte explained that the property owner purchased a dilapidated house and turned it into something beautiful. While Ms. Taylor did not know it was a historic property at the time of purchase, she still wanted to restore certain elements of the home. There was research conducted, and a lot of effort was put into beautifying the property. Commissioner Tripeny stated that the historic nature of the home has more to do with Mr. Bowthorpe and the fact that the house existed prior to 1900 than with a particular style. It is impressive that the house is still standing today.

Chair Roach noted that there is Commissioner support for the historic nature of the home. He reported that the Staff Report includes two sets of suggested Findings and Conditions of Approval. There is a condition that states, “No signage for business use to be located on the property,” which makes sense for the use. He asked to discuss the safe walking path connecting the sidewalks. Right now, it looks like there are trees, and then a sidewalk juts out. If someone decides to park in the area, then it will obstruct pedestrian traffic for those walking in front of the building.

Condition of Approval #4 currently states: “Provide a safe walking path connecting sidewalks on the north and south sides of the property.” Chair Roach suggested that this be amended to state that there must be a physical barrier that prevents people from parking in the space immediately in front of the house. Ms. Marsh reported that there is a sidewalk on both sides, but the sidewalk runs into the wall. She clarified that this is a fairly common scenario. There is another portion of sidewalk on the south side. Discussions were had about appropriate language for the Condition of Approval.

Ms. Marsh reported that all of the parking for the proposed use, both residential and office, would be on the back side of the property. All parking would need to be accessed from Cottonwood Lane around the back of the property. There cannot be parking for the uses on Holladay Boulevard.

Commissioner Fonte asked about a delivery driver accessing the property. Ms. Marsh explained that deliveries could reasonably pull into the area on Holladay Boulevard. It is not possible to control where a delivery truck driver decides to deliver packages, especially when the address is listed as Holladay Boulevard. Chair Roach explained that the physical barrier he described before would eliminate the contradiction between the condition that states there can be no sign for the business and the fact that a sign would need to be placed to state there can be no parking.

Commissioner Prince appreciates the discussion, but is comfortable leaving the Condition of Approval language as drafted. It mentions providing a safe walking path. She does not believe a physical barrier is necessary. A sign is also unnecessary at this location. Ms. Marsh reminded those present that there is a sidewalk on the other side of the street, but there is not a complete sidewalk on this side. Commissioner Prince asked if the tree mentioned earlier is a misty pine or a mystic pine. She does not want to state something specific in a Condition of Approval if it cannot be met. Chair Roach believed a reference to the Colorado Blue Spruce would work well in the condition. Ms. Taylor confirmed that the Colorado Blue Spruce is something she can include.

Commissioner Gong moved to APPROVE the application for a Conditional Use Permit for a Historic Site Modification for the “William J. Bowthorpe House,” designated as a historic site by Section 13.86.020 of the City of Holladay code, located at 4910 South Holladay Boulevard, based on the following findings:

- 1. Modifications are as noted in the summary of the Modifications Report provided by the Community and Economic Development Director.***
- 2. Modifications to the building and site are considered to be substantial as defined by 13.86.050.***
- 3. The owner made modifications to the home to remedy, preserve, and protect a deteriorating historical structure.***
- 4. Original brick and footprint is unaltered and covered with siding.***
- 5. The decorative cedar shingles, trim, rake, eve, and corbels were all restored and replaced.***
- 6. New porch added with significant columns and molding.***
- 7. Modifications increased safety for occupants of the structure.***
- 8. Public right-of-way has been improved with cleaned up landscaping and the addition of new street trees.***

This is also subject to the following conditions, as amended:

- 1. Comply with all Fire Code and Building Safety Code requirements related to building modifications.***

2. *Lighting to comply with commercial lighting standards of Holladay Code 13.84.060.*
3. *No signage for business use to be located on the property.*
4. *Provide a safe walking path connecting sidewalks on north and south sides of property.*
5. *Provide construction details for how siding and porch was attached to show that these modifications are reversible and will not cause further damage to the original brick/adobe should a future owner wish to remove these elements.*
6. *Replanting of a Colorado Blue Spruce on the property.*

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

The Planning Commission discussed the second motion. Commissioner Cunningham suggested an amendment be made to Condition of Approval #5 to remove the word “rental.”

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the application for a Conditional Use Permit for a Historic Site Use as a combined residential unit and professional office space for the “William J. Bowthorpe House,” designated as a historic site by Section 13.86.020 of the City of Holladay Code, located at 4910 South Holladay Boulevard, based on the following findings:

1. *The proposed use as a residential unit is similar in nature and intensity to those included within Chapter 13.86.060, “Additional Uses Allowed.”*
2. *The proposed use as a professional office is similar in nature and intensity to those included within Chapter 13.86.060, “Additional Uses Allowed.”*

This is also subject to the following conditions, as amended:

1. *Comply with all Fire Code and Building Safety Code requirements prior to opening any office services in the building.*
2. *Obtain and maintain a Holladay Business License.*
3. *Lighting to comply with commercial lighting standards of Holladay Code 13.84.060.*
4. *Hours of operation are from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.*
5. *Use is limited to Professional and Business Services, as defined, and one residential dwelling, as defined in Holladay Ordinance 13.04. The occupancy thereof does not imply approval of Short-Term Rental uses.*

6. *No signage for business use to be located on the property.*
7. *Provide a safe walking path connecting sidewalks on the north and south sides of the property.*
8. *Owner, tenants, and employees must park on site.*
9. *All client parking to be located on site.*

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

2. **Partial Vacation of a Public Street – 2755 East Hillsden Drive - Review and Recommendation to City Council of a Request by Applicant Rock Shutjer as Abutting Owner, to Vacate a Portion of Unused Public Street Located at this Address. The Area Under Consideration is Proposed to be Adjusted to Meet the Standard Street Width of 55 Feet Rather than the Current 66 Feet. If Approved, the Difference in Area Vacated is Proposed to be Deeded to Abutting Property Owners. This Item is Reviewed as a Legislative Application as per Provisions Stated in Holladay Ordinance §13.10A.150B and in Compliance with Utah Code Annotated §10.9a.906.5. File #26-1-01.**

Mr. Tuffour presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a request for a Partial Vacation of a Public Street at 2755 East Hillsden Drive. The applicant is attending the meeting and will present the applicant's narrative. He clarified that the request is to vacate a portion of the unused public street. An image was shared. The area marked in red is proposed to be vacated. If the request is approved by the Planning Commission, the area in red will be deeded to the applicant.

Mr. Tuffour reported that the current width of the public right-of-way is approximately 66 feet. Staff looked at the roadway classification, and as defined in the General Plan, this roadway is a secondary residential street. In the General Plan, secondary residential streets have a width of 20 to 50 feet. The current use of the site was also taken into consideration. It is currently being used for landscaping purposes. The TRC also looked at safety, so there were comments received from the Fire Marshal and City Engineer. Minimizing the current width of the public right-of-way will not impact the safety of the current travel lane. Based on the analysis conducted, there are a number of recommended findings included in the Staff Report for Commissioner review.

Commissioner Tripeny asked about the property to the north. He wanted to know if that belongs to the City. It was clarified that it is private property. Chair Roach asked the applicant to present. The applicant, Rock Shutjer, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He is a 45-year resident of Holladay and has lived in nine different homes in the City during that time. Mr. Shutjer always wants to leave things better than he finds them. For the last 15 years, he has been walking down to this area and so he is familiar with the location. This is a charming area with a rural feel. Now that the property has been purchased, he has submitted a request for a partial street vacation.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing.

Brian Bethers gave his address as 5309 South Holladay Boulevard. He explained that vehicles drive quickly off of Holladay Boulevard along Hillsden Drive. Six years ago, a driver on Holladay Boulevard lost control of their vehicle near his home and hit the front mailbox and planter box. That individual rolled their vehicle, and there was a fatality. Mr. Bethers informed the Planning Commission that he has seen firsthand what can happen when individuals drive too quickly.

If the requested area becomes personal property, a fence of six feet in height of any kind can be placed on the boundary. Right next to that property is a cut-through from Hillsden Drive that goes up to Holladay Boulevard. A number of years ago, the City received so many complaints from residents about safety issues in the area that money was spent to put in a sidewalk on the west side of Holladay Boulevard. People were concerned about their safety walking from Hillsden Drive to Holladay Boulevard. Mr. Bethers explained that if the applicant installs a fence, it will make it difficult to see the vehicles coming down from Holladay Boulevard. It will also make the blind corner even more challenging. He asked the Planning Commission to consider some restrictions.

Chair Roach noted that there are clear view requirements for a corner like the one described. Mr. Tuffour confirmed this. He explained that there are clear view restrictions in place for private properties. Commissioner Prince believed that what currently exists would be allowed, because the fence is low, but nothing higher than that could be placed near the corner. This was confirmed. Mr. Tuffour noted that one of the recommendations in the Staff Report addresses this. It states:

- Recommended Finding #7:
 - If approved, the property owner must work with the Public Works Department to configure the intersection design at the south western corner of the applicant's property in a way that ensures travel safety and visibility.

Mary Lamb explained that she lives at 5364 South Hillsden Drive and is across the street from the applicant property. Her only concern is that she has a long bed truck and she needs a right angle to get between two brick entrances at the gate. That takes a fairly large arc. On the south side, there is a blind curve, so her concern has to do with whether there is enough room to maneuver.

Marsh Flint gave his address as 2270 East Murray Holladay Road. He echoed some of the comments about walkability in the area. He runs in that area a lot and it can be scary for pedestrians, especially at night. Mr. Flint asked that the seventh recommended finding be strengthened to consider pedestrian safety, especially since this is a right-of-way vacation.

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

Mr. Tuffour clarified that the vacation will not take from the existing travel lane. He described the current conditions, which include low walls and landscaping. That landscaped area is what is proposed to be vacated, so it will not encroach onto the current travel lane. The configuration of the existing travel lane will not be modified if the Planning Commission approves this application.

Mr. Shutjer appreciated the comments shared during the public hearing. He explained that safety is also something he takes seriously. It was clarified that the asphalt will remain the way it is, so the vacation will not create a new situation with the road. There have been discussions about a fence, and he likes the idea of having a two-foot fence, which would meet clear view standards.

Commissioner Gong asked if the vacation creates an obligation for the owner to increase public safety in the area. She wanted to know if that would be a reasonable condition despite the fact that the vacation is not changing the current conditions, and the road is not being narrowed. Mr. Teerlink explained that certain elements, such as a gutter, park strip, and sidewalk, are not envisioned in this location. If those elements were envisioned there, the vacation would not be recommended. Mr. Tuffour reiterated that the current travel lane will not be reduced or minimized, but even if it were, research shows that wide curves actually increase speeding potential for drivers.

Commissioner Fonte noted that the vacated property is within the small fence that exists, which was confirmed. Chair Roach stated that he did not originally know that it was not private property. He asked Commissioners to comment on the recommended findings in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Prince mentioned the seventh finding. She believes it addresses some of the concerns that have been mentioned by residents. It requires collaboration with the Public Works Department. Commissioner Gong asked for additional information about the tenth finding. Mr. Tuffour explained that if granted approval, the building height for this property will not change.

Commissioner Cunningham moved to APPROVE the Partial Street Vacation at 2755 East Hillsden Drive at the intersection of East Hillsden Drive and 5345 South, on behalf and in benefit of “2755 East Hillsden Drive,” a residential property in the R-1-43 Zone, based upon the following findings, as amended:

- 1. All properties subject to this application will remain in compliance with the R-1-43 Zoning regulations and standards.***
- 2. No new property, lots, or right-of-way will be created by the application.***
- 3. Proposed area to be vacated must begin at a surveyed distance of 25 feet from the center of the travel lane in order to meet the General Plan’s roadway classification requirement.***
- 4. If approved and combined with existing parcel(s), a lot consolidation shall be completed.***
- 5. If the City conveys the vacated land to adjacent property owner, the demarcated parcel must be purchased at appraised market value.***
- 6. Unified Fire Authority (“UFA”) does not have any concerns with the proposed partial vacation, as no limitations are imposed on Fire Department access turnaround or snow storage requirements.***

7. *If approved, the property owner must work with the Public Works Department to configure the intersection design at the southwestern corner of the applicant's property in a way that ensures vehicle and pedestrian travel safety and visibility.*
8. *Good Cause for the vacation is established based on the following findings:*
 - a. *The portion of street requested for vacation is operationally defunct for travel, connectivity, and unmaintained.*
 - b. *Proposed investments to use the space will improve neighborhood's appearance.*
 - c. *Maintains City standard public road dimensions and does not completely limit access.*
9. *Neither the public interest nor any person will be materially injured by the vacation.*
10. *No windfall enrichment to the abutting property owner is found when considering the added area and its relation to substantial property right(s). (I.e. the added area will not provide subdivision opportunity, added building height, or additional land uses not currently enjoyed by property within the vicinity, etc.)*

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

The Planning Commission took a short break before considering the last Public Hearing item.

3. **“Royal Holladay Hills, Block H, I, and J” – Preliminary Plan – 1950 East Rodeo Walk Drive. (R/M-U Zone) – Concept and Preliminary Review and Consideration of Development/Construction Details Submitted by Applicant, Steve Peterson, for Blocks H, I and J 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 #19-9-19-11.**

Mr. Teerlink presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Preliminary Site Plan for “Royal Holladay Hills, Block H, I, and J.” These blocks are proposed to be developed with an athletic club, parking structure, retail space, and associated landscaping. He suggested the Planning Commission focus on the civil engineering, access to the site, and compliance with the phasing plan of the SDMP. An element of the Site Plan that is slightly different than originally proposed in the SDMP is the access to the parking garage. Driveway access is proposed, which will be improved with pedestrian paths on either side, as well as some landscaping.

Retail pads are proposed along the Rodeo Walk Drive access, which is the primary north-south access. There are three land use zones within the Master Plan, and the Open Zone is the most flexible. It allows for the highest number of uses at the highest intensity and at the highest heights. Mr. Teerlink reported that compliance with the SDMP for land use and layout has been verified by the TRC. The Commission primarily needs to look at architecture. The Meeting Materials

Packet includes some conceptual renderings of what the building facades are proposed to look like. However, some updated drawings have since been received from the applicant and will be shared.

The other element the Planning Commission will look at is landscaping. Mr. Teerlink reported that there are Landscaping Plans included in the Meeting Materials Packet for Commissioner review. In addition, there is a Lighting Plan that can be reviewed. The TRC recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Site Plan. In 13.08 of the code for Site Plan Developments, the Final Site Plan is delegated to Staff. That process clarifies civil site drainage and engineering elements. He reminded Commissioners that there was recent approval of a modification to the property lines. The lot line adjustment modified the property line locations.

Commissioner Prince mentioned the driveway that was not originally planned. She asked if this is the road that went between the retail and the athletic club parking structure, which was confirmed. Chair Roach noted that the setbacks on the parking structure are zero. Mr. Teerlink explained that in the SDMP, there are no setbacks in the R/M-U Zone. There are a lot of retail front doors that are accessed right off the sidewalk. He reported that there are generally no setbacks so there is some level of flexibility provided, and the site can be arranged as needed.

The applicant, Steve Peterson, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He explained that the Commission is being asked to consider the Preliminary Site Plan for Blocks H, I, and J of the “Royal Holladay Hills Development.” There is excitement to have Life Time Fitness come to the community. There is also retail proposed in front of that, which will be located along Rodeo Walk Drive. The lane that was mentioned earlier is primarily a private lane. It is not the road where the majority of the traffic will be located. That lane might be used for garbage removal and deliveries, but the primary focus there will be on servicing the building. Access to the parking structure comes in off of Rodeo Walk Drive. The parking structure is three stories high, but it is possible to access the top level from Sunset Road. The structure is also buffered from the retail in the front, so the view is minimized. A lot of thought has gone into the design as well as the landscaping.

It was noted that a representative from Life Time Fitness is attending the meeting and can answer Commissioner questions. Mr. Peterson shared an updated rendering with the Planning Commission, as the renderings have been updated since the Meeting Materials Packet was published. Commissioner Prince noted that in the Meeting Materials Packet, there were west and south elevations included. What is currently shown is a new west elevation. She asked if there were changes proposed to the south elevation as well. Mr. Peterson denied this.

Chair Roach asked if the Life Time Fitness property includes the landscape buffer between the building and the parking lot. The Site Plan was shared for reference. Mr. Peterson reported that there is a buffer on every side with the exception of the east side, where there is a retaining wall. Chair Roach wanted to know what the blank space between the landscape and the building is. Dan Beavers from Life Time explained that he is the Development Manager for the project. The white space shown to the left of the building is an artificial turf space. That space will be fenced in, which will make it possible to hold classes in that area or even have programming for children.

Commissioner Fonte noted that there are two swimming pools shown. She asked if one is an indoor pool and the other is an outdoor pool. Mr. Beavers clarified that the swimming pool will

be outdoors. There is a lap pool and a leisure pool envisioned. The lap pool will be open year-round. There will be heating underneath the pavers to accommodate that year-round use.

Commissioner Gong had a question about how pedestrian traffic will flow from the parking structure to other areas of the development. It does not appear that there are paths from the parking structure. Mr. Beavers reported that the primary path for Life Time Fitness members comes out of the lower right corner of the parking garage. There is a sidewalk attached to the roadway that goes to the front door of the business. That sidewalk will be eight feet to ensure it is wide enough.

Mack Woodbury introduced himself and explained that he is with the developer. When retail is planned, there is a focus on pedestrian traffic. There must be safe and accessible ways for pedestrians to access the retail spaces. He noted that there is an access coming east off Rodeo Walk Drive and into the parking structure. North of that is surface parking. He added that the parking structure itself is designed to be a retail-focused parking structure. Mr. Woodbury shared information about the exits located inside the parking structure. Everything was designed with lighting, bollards, and landscaping so pedestrian traffic is safely funneled from the parking areas to the retail environments. Several renderings were reviewed with the Planning Commission.

There has been a focus on pedestrian transitions to ensure that this will be an appealing environment. Mr. Woodbury explained that a lot of time has been spent studying the area to determine the walking time it will take to access the different retail areas. Commissioner Gong thanked him for the clarification. There was additional discussion about proposed pedestrian walkways.

Commissioner Prince mentioned the renderings that were shown by the applicant team. It appears that there is some parking right against some of the retail pads. Mr. Woodbury explained that the rendering software sometimes adds vehicles there. He clarified that there will not be parking in that location. However, he stated that the existing street conditions will not be changed. Ms. Marsh reported that parallel parking spots will be on Rodeo Walk Drive. Mr. Woodbury confirmed that Rodeo Walk Drive will remain as built. Landscape elements will be added to the parking lot.

Commissioner Prince asked about the exit from the top deck of the parking structure to Sunset Drive. Mr. Peterson explained that the parking structure is three levels. The first level goes down slightly from grade, then there is the center level, and then it is possible to exit from the third level onto Sunset Drive. Chair Roach thanked the applicant for answering Commissioner questions.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing.

Marsh Flint gave his address as 2270 East Murray Holladay Road. He is excited about the development and expressed support for what has been proposed. The pedestrian access between Sunset Drive and Arbor Lane was mentioned. He asked about compliance with the SDMP for pedestrian circulation in that area. Chair Roach noted that the applicant can address that question.

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

Mr. Peterson explained that when the project started, there was work done with the neighborhood to the east. It is anticipated that there might be pedestrian access into the project near the park area, but there is no traffic allowed through the neighborhood to the east due to neighborhood preference. Commissioner Gong stated that she does not consider artificial turf to be green space. To the left of the Life Time Fitness building, there is the previously mentioned fenced-in area that is not open to the public access. To the right, there is an area that is publicly accessible and is green space.

Commissioner Gong read the following language from the SDMP document: “The architectural vision of the Cottonwood Development is to create an urban realm with distinct places, including a central plaza, a mixed-use main street, and residential edge streets.” She does not see that happening here. Mr. Peterson explained that the main plaza is in Block B and there will be a lot of gathering areas. The green space requirement is exceeded. He assumes that the section of artificial turf associated with Life Time Fitness will allow members to exercise outside.

Commissioner Gong asked if the sidewalk will be eight feet throughout or if that is only in the area near the parking structure. Mr. Beavers explained that the eight feet is only in the section between the parking structure and the Life Time Fitness main entrance. The sidewalk width varies elsewhere. Mr. Woodbury explained that the width differs based on the primary access points.

Commissioner Fonte moved to APPROVE the Preliminary Site Development Plan for Blocks H, I, and J of the “Royal Holladay Hills Development,” located in the R/M-U Zone, located at 1947, 1949, 1965, 1975, and 1977 East Rodeo Walk Drive, with Final Site Plan and Plat approvals to be delegated to Staff. 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.***

This is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. In accordance with §13.08.010(E), final verification of all details discussed in this meeting and final civil site development approvals shall be by the Land Use Authority (TRC). All final civil development standards of review, as required by Holladay engineering, shall be submitted by the applicant to the CED Department and finalized by this step prior to any site improvements.***

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

ADJOURN

Chair Roach moved to ADJOURN the Planning Commission Meeting. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:55 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 3, 2026.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: June 2, 2026