

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

Tuesday, April 28, 2026

6:00 PM

Temporary City Council Chambers

3330 South 1300 East

Millcreek, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair

Karianne Prince

Angela Gong

Jill Fonte

Patrick Tripeny

Brian Berndt

Paul Cunningham

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 5:38 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners are present. There is one Public Hearing item on the Regular Meeting agenda, which is a Zone Map Amendment. He asked City Staff to provide information on the agenda item.

City Planner, Carrie Marsh, explained that the Zone Map Amendment request involves four parcels. Three of the parcels are on Highland Drive on a one-way bypass lane, and one parcel is on 6060 South. The zoning is split, with the three parcels zoned R-2-10 and the one parcel zoned R-1-10. Ms. Marsh shared background information about zoning in the area. 6060 South is unique because there are several non-conforming duplexes. The whole area was zoned R-2-10 when it was under Salt Lake County. When the City of Holladay was incorporated, the south side of the street retained the R-2-10 Zone, and the north side of the street went to R-1-10. However, there was eventually a shift, and the whole street became R-1-10. She reviewed a zoning map of the area.

Ms. Marsh reiterated that there are non-conforming duplexes on 6060 South, as well as some areas with higher intensity. Chair Roach wanted to understand how the parcel went from R-2-10 to R-1-10. Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, reported that the City of Holladay was incorporated in 2000. There were concerns that a lot of properties would be subdivided, so the general land use in an area was considered, and a less dense zone was selected. There are some non-conforming uses, such as duplexes, which were allowed when originally built. Chair Roach believed the original zoning for the City of Holladay was intended to prevent subdivision and denser development at that time. Mr. Teerlink assumed that was the rationale behind the decision made.

There was discussion about zoning and what happened when the City first incorporated. Chair Roach noted that the Residential Multi-Family (“R-M”) Zone is a higher-density zone. Ms. Marsh clarified that the R-M Zone does not have as high a density as the original County R-M Zone.

Ms. Marsh mentioned the bypass lane or slip lane that is located in front of the three properties. She explained that it services those parcels, so if one of the individual parcels was developed on its own, that lane would need to be retained so the other parcels would still have access. However, with coordination between property owners, the slip lane does not need to be retained for access. The access could be changed to the middle of the property or the rear of the property in order to access redeveloped dwelling units. The applicant has proposed eliminating their access off of that road. Closure of that road is supported by the City Engineer, but the City Council would make the final decision. Chair Roach noted that what is currently before the Planning Commission is the rezone.

Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that the City anticipates the reconfiguration of Highland Drive in 2030. He asked if there have been discussions between the City and the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) about a realignment of that intersection. Ms. Marsh stated that this would need to be discussed with the City Engineer. She does not believe anything has been finalized at this time. Ms. Marsh clarified that the island shown is owned by the City.

Information about the daily number of trips is included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Ms. Marsh reported that 6060 South is a 37-foot-wide right-of-way. She noted that rights-of-way have options to be widened at the discretion of the City Engineer. This would typically occur if there was development, as there might be certain infrastructure improvements required. During the discussions about this application, the Planning Commission can consider the fact that some roads may be widened and there may be some reconfiguration with the future Highland Drive work.

Chair Roach asked if 6060 South, as it currently exists, conforms with the fire lanes and turnaround widths. Ms. Marsh reported that there was a fire turnaround added when new development in the area occurred. There could be additional fire requirements with the development of new dwelling units, but that would be determined when there is an actual application submitted for review.

Commissioner Patrick Tripeny stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to consider a Zone Map Amendment with more dense zoning. Ms. Marsh explained that a rezone establishes the maximum allowed density, but the developer of the property does not need to maximize the density. For instance, there might be a situation where a developer chooses to build 15 units instead of the 20 allowed under the zone. She shared several example scenarios. Commissioner Tripeny believed the rezone to R-M would allow the owner to build a certain number of units on the property, but there would be no obligation to build to the maximum. This was confirmed.

Chair Roach asked what would happen if the Zone Map Amendment was approved and the applicant then applied for a Planned Unit Development (“PUD”). He wanted to know if the dwelling count could be further increased. Ms. Marsh denied this and explained that a PUD allows for reconfiguration of the allowed density. It is not possible to alter density or height with a PUD.

Commissioner Brian Berndt wanted to know if units in this area would be considered moderate-income housing. Ms. Marsh explained that there is some information about this in the Staff Report. When more units are allowed in an area, the units naturally become smaller. The applicant narrative talks about townhomes that are slightly smaller in size, which would be more affordable. Ms. Marsh believed what is envisioned would be close to moderate-income housing, but Economic Development and Housing Manager, Ann Frances Garcia, can share additional information during the Regular Meeting. There are certain factors that need to be considered, such as the size of the unit and the number of bedrooms in the unit. It is based on the Area Median Income (“AMI”).

A lot of the townhouses that have been built more recently are larger. Typically, a larger footprint means there is a higher sale price for each of the townhouse units. Many recent townhouses in the community have been over 2,200 square feet, but the size of the unit could be as much as 3,500 square feet. Commissioner Tripeny asked whether an owner of a townhouse unit owns the land underneath. Ms. Marsh explained that townhouses can be handled in a number of different ways. It is common to see areas that are privately owned. Some townhome developments have all of the open area as limited common area. There are many ways the land can be subdivided.

Commissioner Jill Fonte asked if the Planning Commission is looking at a rezone to R-M that includes 20 dwelling units that are proposed for somewhere between \$800,000 and \$850,000 each. Ms. Marsh clarified that the Planning Commission is looking at a rezone application for 1.24 acres of land. A rezone to the R-M Zone would allow there to be up to 19 units. There might be a slight variation based on the survey, so there could be either 19 or 20 units allowed on the rezoned site.

Commissioner Karianne Prince requested that the City Attorney provide information about rezone requests. City Attorney, Brad Christopherson, reported that under State Code, the Planning Commission's role in a rezone is to conduct a public hearing, receive feedback, evaluate the request to see if it conforms with the General Plan, and make a recommendation to the City Council. The Planning Commission is tasked with making either a positive or negative recommendation to the City Council. He noted that this request likely does not qualify as moderate-income housing, but it could still meet the goal of the General Plan to have multiple types of housing available.

Commissioner Berndt noted that the Staff Report mentions several relevant sections of the General Plan. He asked if all of those items are weighed equally during the decision-making process. Ms. Marsh noted that there is a little more pressure on moderate-income housing, because there are specific requirements from the State. Commissioner Berndt asked if there was a Site Plan submitted with this application. Ms. Marsh reported that there was a Conceptual Plan submitted in the applicant narrative, which showed a line of townhouses. Commissioner Berndt explained that he would be more inclined to support higher density if he knew how it would impact the neighborhood. He agrees that there are a lot of non-conforming structures in the area already, but he does not want development that will add to the problem. There was discussion about impacts.

The Work Session was closed at 6:08 p.m. and 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 approximately 6:10 p.m. All members of the Commission are present. The Opening Statement was read aloud by Commissioner Cunningham.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Zone Map Amendment - Rezone from R-2-10 and R-1-10 to R-M - 6037, 6049, and 6051 South Highland Drive and 1995 East 6060 South. Review and Recommendation to City Council on a Proposal by the Property Owners of Four Parcels to Amend to the Holladay Zone Map at this Location from the Current, Residential Two-Family Zone (R-2-10) (Highland Drive Parcels), and Residential Single-Family (R-1-10) Zone (6060 South Parcel) to the Residential Multi-Family (R-M) Zone for Approximately 1.24 Acres of Property. Item Reviewed as a Legislative Action, According to Procedures set forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. File #26-4-03.

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that this application is for a Zone Map Amendment. The proposed rezone is for 6037, 6049, and 6051 South Highland Drive, and 1995 East 6060 South. The three properties on Highland Drive are currently in the R-2-10 Zone and the property on 6060 South is in the R-1-10 Zone. The proposal is to rezone all four parcels to the R-M Zone. The total area of land is 1.24 acres. She explained that the R-M Zone allows for different configurations of dwelling units, depending on the amount of land area. In the R-M Zone, each single-family detached dwelling requires 5,000 square feet of land, an attached two-family dwelling requires 4,000 square feet of land per unit, and each unit in a multi-family dwelling requires 2,722.5 square feet of land per unit. With the total area of land, the rezone could allow:

- 10 single-family dwelling units;
- 12 twin/attached dwelling units and 1 single-family home (7 total structures); and
- 19 multi-family dwelling units (3 or more units per structure; range of 1 to 6 structures).

Property owners are not required to utilize the full capacity of the allowed density in a zone. It is possible to build less than the density allows. Ms. Marsh noted that with more units in an area, there tend to be smaller units. The applicant is proposing up to 20 units, depending on the land area. If there is not enough land area for 20 units, the proposal is for 19 smaller-sized townhomes. In the applicant narrative, it states that these would be approximately 1,600 square feet per unit.

Ms. Marsh shared a zoning map with the Planning Commission. She pointed out the R-1-10 Zone, which is bordered by some R-2-8 and R-2-10 zoning. The darker red shown on the map represents the C-2 Zone, and there is also the Holladay Crossroads (“HCR”) Zone at the bottom. There is new development happening in the HCR Zone with residential units in a multi-level structure. Properties currently zoned as C-2 could be rezoned to the higher intensity HCR Zone in the future. The recommendation from Staff and the Technical Review Committee (“TRC”), which is seen in the Staff Report, was based on a transitional area between the lower intensity R-2 Zone and the higher intensity HCR Zone. She explained that the R-M Zone would provide further transition.

The heights in the R-M Zone are 35 feet, based on the property size, which is the same as what is allowed in the R-2 Zone. Ms. Marsh reported that the setbacks are also the same in the R-2 Zone and the R-M Zone, so there would only be an increase in the number of units allowed.

Ms. Marsh further reviewed the zoning map and pointed out the properties zoned as R-1-10 on 6060 South. There are eight residential properties zoned as R-1-10, and four of them are legal non-conforming duplexes. The two parcels directly east of the 1995 East 6060 South property are attached. She clarified that there is a twin home there that is divided into separate ownership. The

R-2-8 Zone shown has three newer homes. Under Salt Lake County, the whole area was R-2-10, but when the City of Holladay incorporated, there were some changes made, and the area became R-1-10.

When reviewing a Zone Map Amendment, there are certain factors that should be considered. This includes adequacy of the facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, such as roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, environmental hazard mitigation measures, water supply, and wastewater and refuse collection. The Staff Report talks about the infrastructure context, because this is a unique area where there is a slip lane that serves the three properties located on Highland Drive. The presence of that slip lane creates more hazardous situations for the people living in Highland Pointe Village.

The applicant has proposed changing the access and not having driveways for the three properties on the slip lane. Without driveways there, the City Engineer would feel comfortable with closing the slip lane. Ms. Marsh mentioned the future Highland Drive redevelopment. She explained that the Highland Drive reconstruction proposal is envisioned to move forward in the next five years.

6060 South is a 37-foot-wide road. Ms. Marsh explained that with redevelopment, there can be dedications required to widen roads to standard widths. That is something the City Engineer would manage with the property owner at the time of development, but it is possible that the roadway could increase in width. There might be additional fire requirements if a second means of egress is required. She clarified that this will depend on the number of units the roadway will serve. The Fire Marshal reviews plans to make sure all developments meet the fire and safety standards. The City Engineer also reviews the plans to make sure engineering and road standards are met.

Chair Roach asked if any short-term rentals would be available on that road under the current City Ordinance. Ms. Marsh explained that short-term rentals would not be allowed there because of the width. Both the R-2 Zone and R-M Zone allow short-term rentals, but it has to be located on a roadway that is 66 feet wide or more. Both requirements need to be met before a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) application can be submitted. Chair Roach asked if properties on Highland Drive are currently allowed to have short-term rentals. Ms. Marsh was not certain.

The next section of the Staff Report looks at the General Plan application. There was a General Plan update in 2025 and there was significant community engagement throughout that process. Ms. Marsh reported that there are several points outlined in the Staff Report, such as future land use, distinct character, quality neighborhoods, walkable and connected communities, a strong local economy, and responsible renewal and infill. The Wasatch Choice Vision document was shared.

Ms. Marsh explained that the TRC reviews rezones. The applicant's request is supported by Staff. There were discussions about splitting the property with R-M on the front three parcels and R-2 on the rear parcel. There could be three additional units if the property is zoned entirely as R-M versus that split. The TRC recommendation is in the Staff Report as well as the standards.

Commissioner Prince does not see any other R-M near the applicant property. Ms. Marsh shared background information about the zoning that was in place before the City of Holladay incorporated. Several large developments in the area were developed under the previous zoning

that was in place. Ms. Marsh noted that there is a similar zoning pattern seen around the Holladay Village area.

The applicant, Kasey Kershaw, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He has lived in the City of Holladay for 20 years and went through a similar process approximately three years ago for 5305 Highland Drive. He has been a real estate broker for 30 years and has handled half a dozen small developments on his own. Mr. Kershaw shared information about this application and the purchase of 6049 and 6051 South Highland Drive. He next met with the person who owned the property to the north and eventually purchased 6037 South Highland Drive. There was a discussion about access with Public Services Director, Jared Bunch. He explained that access determines how the parcel can be developed. A comment was made about the potential removal of the bypass lane, so a project was contemplated that would remove the bypass lane from the area.

Mr. Kershaw explained that he has done multiple townhome projects in the past, and the original plan was to develop the three parcels into 12 townhomes. Council Member Emily Gray suggested that he speak to some of the neighbors. Mr. Kershaw spoke to several neighbors, including the owner of 1995 East 6060 South, who expressed an interest in selling her property for the development. According to Staff, it is easier to do a zone change when there is more property.

Mr. Kershaw wants there to be a quality development in the area. While the R-M Zone could allow for 20 units, he is not interested in that many. There would likely be between 16 and 18 units. The proposal is to have individual ownership. Some photographs are included in the submitted materials to demonstrate what he is interested in building. The townhomes are envisioned to be three stories with living space on the main level. Each unit would have some fenced yard space. Some higher-grade exterior finishes are also contemplated for the development.

During the first meeting with the neighbors, it was stated that there would be 12 units, but that was before the property at 1995 East 6060 South was added. Mr. Kershaw shared comments about density and noted that some other cities allow more density than the City of Holladay. He acknowledged that there are neighborhood concerns about privacy, but the setback from the property line is 20 feet. The proposed project also sits adjacent to the common area of the Diamond Hills Subdivision.

Commissioner Fonte mentioned a reference to a pocket park in the submitted materials. She pointed out that parks need to be maintained and wondered how that area would be maintained as a park for the residents. Mr. Kershaw clarified that he does not have authority over what is done in that location, but there is an opportunity to vacate the bypass lane. He has provided a suggestion in the submitted materials, because a small park would benefit everyone living in the area.

Mr. Kershaw corrected earlier information provided about the proposed units. He reported that these are envisioned to be between 2,200 to 2,400 square feet. There will also be two car garages. There was additional discussion about a potential small park and the associated maintenance.

Commissioner Tripeny mentioned the images included in the submitted materials. He thought the exteriors were aesthetically pleasing, but noted that there are stairs into every unit. Those stairs would prevent this from being an inclusive community. If there are more than three steps to the front door, the design will exclude those with mobility issues. He asked that this be considered.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. He noted that there were several comments submitted ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. Those comments were summarized and read into the record. Dianne Hazen at 6075 Highland Drive endorsed new ideas. Scott Johnson and Amy Johnson, the owners of Cottonwood Garage located at 2049 East 6200 South, also endorse the new build ideas proposed for the site. Paul Knott resides at 6010 South Diamond Hills Lane and expressed concerns about the proposed rezone and the impacts to traffic. Jalal Miraffie at 6049 South Highland Drive expressed support for the rezone. Angie Meredith at 2005 East Diamond Hills Lane is thrilled that someone wants to clean up this particular area, as it is not well-kept. However, she has concerns about traffic coming out of the street and the apartments further to the south.

There were also comments submitted from Daniel Lawler at 6018 Emerald Ridge Cove, who stated that the current homes are an eyesore. Joni Wilson, who is one of the sellers, located at 1995 East 6060 South, feels positive about the proposal. Hunter Bergamasco at 6004 South Albertville Place noted that there is already congestion in the area and expressed concerns about adding more people to an already congested location in the City. Carmen Diaz at 6007 South Ruby Ridge Cove is opposed to the rezone and mentioned traffic concerns. Rob Jones at 6037 South Highland Drive expressed support for the proposed Zone Map Amendment. Chair Roach noted that there are additional comments in the Meeting Materials Packet. He asked those present to share comments.

Nan Williams gave her address as 6011 Lake Placid Place and stated that the positive comments about the rezone are focused on the economics. Those who have lived in the area for a long time and intend to remain in the area know how difficult it is to maneuver on Highland Drive. There is a church and an elementary school to the north, so she suggested the rezone not be approved. She pointed out that the proposed project will add dozens of additional vehicles to the area.

Dwight Williams gave his address as 6011 Lake Placid Place. He understands there are approximately 80 units in the apartment building that is a block to the south of the subject property. The assumption is that there would be approximately 100 vehicles tied to that apartment building. Mr. Williams explained that it is already difficult to make a left turn out of The Willows and is nearly impossible during rush hour. While he agrees that what is proposed would upgrade the aesthetics of the subject property, there are concerns about the amount of traffic and overall safety.

Carmen Diaz stated that she lives at 6007 South Ruby Ridge Cove. The applicant stated that the property would overlook a common area, but on the other side of the wall is the swimming pool. While that is a common area, it is also a swimming area and a place where there are gatherings. She supports progress, but there are already issues getting in and out of Diamond Hills Lane. Ms. Diaz shared information about the nearby apartment project and the existing issues in the area.

Shelley Mangum gave her address as 6019 Diamond Hills Lane and expressed concerns about traffic. She recommended that a police officer monitor the traffic and speeds in the area. There are also concerns about sewer issues due to the apartment building and other developments being added to the area. Ms. Mangum supports closing the bypass lane, but would like more information about access. She is a retired law enforcement officer and is concerned about increased crime.

Elena Zhdanov lives at 6006 Albertville Place and reiterated the concerns that have been expressed about traffic. There are already traffic jams during rush hour, and she is concerned about adding more traffic to the area. She pointed out that there is not a lot of space to expand. Ms. Zhdanov works nearby and often walks in the area, but there are sidewalk issues and safety concerns. She does not believe it is possible to make this a more walkable area, given the restraints.

Peaches Cederholm gave her address as 6034 South Oslo Bay. She had concerns about traffic and the proposed park. Information about the turning lane was provided, and she noted that there are often problems. She is not sure how the proposal will slow down the traffic. For this area to be walkable, there would need to be an investment made in sidewalks. It was mentioned earlier in the meeting that there is a Highland Drive reconstruction plan envisioned, but there is a lot that can happen in five years. She added that there are noise issues associated with the traffic.

Mary Lou Visebeck gave her address as 6028 South Calgary Court. She had concerns about the number of units that are proposed for the site. There is a preference to see twin homes rather than townhouses on the site. She expressed concerns about traffic and safety in the community.

Dianne Hazen identified herself as the owner of Diamond's Custom Jewelers at 6065 South Highland Drive. She loves it when there is new development in the City of Holladay, but has some concerns about what could happen on 6060 South. She noted that there needs to be appropriate access. Ms. Hazen is not against the proposal but wants to understand what will happen with the existing traffic.

David Wells gave his address as 2011 Pheasant Way. He understands that there are pros and cons to consider with the proposed rezone, so he asked the Planning Commission to consider whether this is consistent with what is outlined in the General Plan. In addition, he feels there needs to be some comfort provided to residents that the traffic issues described are being addressed.

Stacie Pearce is at Renew Rx at 6065 South Highland Drive. The current houses are dilapidated, and she looks forward to something being done to improve the area. However, there are concerns about the traffic situation that currently exists. She asked if there are creative solutions that can be explored, as she is worried that her patients will not have access to the clinic.

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

Chair Roach reminded those present that the Planning Commission is considering the Zone Map Amendment request. It was clarified that 6060 South will not be closed. Commissioner Berndt asked if the City Engineer provided any clarification about when or if that road would be widened. Ms. Marsh denied this. When there is a road that does not meet the standard width, improvements may be required. Commissioner Berndt asked about the infrastructure concerns. It was noted that the City Engineer stated the number of proposed units would not impact the existing infrastructure.

Commissioner Fonte asked if infrastructure has to do only with traffic, because there were comments made during the public hearing about water and sewage. Ms. Marsh explained that any development plans would be reviewed by the utility providers, including the relevant water provider and power company. Upgrades may be required by the various utility providers in order to meet the demand for the number of units that are being installed. Commissioner Prince asked

who would pay for those improvements. Mr. Christopherson reported that Utah Code requires developers to pay for that kind of development. Taxpayers do not pay for new development. When there is new development coming to an area, the impacts are not borne by existing residents. Ms. Marsh shared information about traffic studies and the known information for Highland Drive.

Commissioner Cunningham wanted to know if it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to recommend that the City Council condition an approval on some moderate-income housing. Mr. Christopherson does not believe there could be a condition like that in this case, unless there was an application for tax increment financing or a desire to have bonus density.

Commissioner Berndt asked about the number of units that could be built on the four lots if there was development under the current zoning. Ms. Marsh estimated that there would be approximately two units per parcel. There was discussion about the average number of vehicle trips per day. Commissioner Berndt wanted to understand the traffic impacts associated with a rezone. Ms. Marsh explained that if there were six vehicle trips per day and 18 total units, that would be 108 vehicle trips associated with the development. Mr. Christopherson pointed out that this does not deduct what is currently there, so there would be approximately 84 additional trips.

Mr. Christopherson shared information about traffic studies. He clarified that these studies look at whether the road capacity can handle the size of the development that is proposed. It is unlikely that a traffic study will state that Highland Drive cannot handle the additional vehicle trips associated with the development. Ms. Marsh added that when traffic becomes an issue, engineering solutions are explored to manage the traffic. The solution is not necessarily to prevent additional development, but to look at how to best manage the increased traffic on the roadways.

Commissioner Fonte noted that engineered solutions are not the responsibility of the developer, so she wants to understand when the City would start to explore engineered options. Ms. Marsh reported that there are redevelopment plans for Highland Drive. The challenge with exploring and implementing different solutions often has to do with funding. Chair Roach asked to further review the zoning map. He appreciates the background information that was provided by Staff about the existing zoning. His main concern is that the shift from the existing zones to R-M will significantly increase density. Although the applicant seems genuine about the product he would like to produce and the number of units, there have been situations where a property is sold, and then the new developer creates something that maximizes the density. The rezone would allow up to 20 units.

Putting aside the traffic concerns that have been expressed, from a zoning perspective, there are concerns about an R-M spot zone. Chair Roach appreciates the information included in the Staff Report about the General Plan, but he has concerns about the number of units that could be developed. He shared comments about the existing trees on the site. Chair Roach thought the spot zone of R-M was too much, but he would not be as concerned if a less dense zone was proposed.

Commissioner Prince can see the advantage of an R-M Zone where the height is limited. This proposal would allow for higher density, but would not be as dense as the nearby apartment building. It would provide a transition from the twin homes down the street and the Diamond Hills units. She can see that it would create progression in terms of density, which is part of the General Plan. Commissioner Prince believed the current Zone Map Amendment was a reasonable request.

Commissioner Gong felt similarly to Commissioner Prince. In context, the R-M Zone makes sense and is the kind of responsible renewal and infill that the City should consider. This is on a road that can handle additional traffic and has reasonable public transportation available. Commissioner Berndt asked if it would make sense to have the east parcel be zoned R-2-8. Chair Roach stated that if R-2-8 was proposed for the entire application, then he would be supportive.

Commissioner Tripeny visited the properties earlier in the day and also went into the Diamond Hills area. He pointed out that Diamond Hills is similar, but that development happened at a different time. It was higher density than the single-family housing that existed. He shared information about the development that has been occurring in his neighborhood. Given the housing prices in the City of Holladay, the cost of the townhouses envisioned as part of this development would be considered more reasonable. He does not see that the R-M Zone would adversely impact the neighborhood. While the development envisioned by the applicant will not necessarily improve the traffic, the traffic issues exist and have not been caused by the proposal.

Commissioner Fonte had hoped to see more of a compromise between R-1-10 and R-M. She was concerned about density. While she understands that the General Plan calls for more density, particularly along these high-traffic areas, she would like to see more of a transition. She reiterated her concerns about the park area that was mentioned in the submitted materials. The developer might create something that is aesthetically pleasing, but it would be unlikely to be maintained. Commissioner Fonte is concerned that the contemplated park area could turn into an eyesore.

Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that if the requested R-M Zone is denied, the applicant can consider whether a lower-density proposal would still make sense. That being said, he feels there is an opportunity to expand the commercial mix. Commissioner Prince reminded those present that a decision needs to be made on what is actually before the Planning Commission rather than what Commissioners might prefer to see. She is prepared to move forward with a motion.

Commissioner Prince moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council to APPROVE an application by Kasey Kershaw to amend the City of Holladay Zoning Map for 1.24 acres of land, located at 6037 South, 6049 South, and 6051 South Highland Drive, and at 1995 East 6060 South, from the R-2-10 and R-1-10 Zone to the R-M Zone, based on the following findings:

- 1. The proposed amendment is compliant with the Purpose of the Land Development Code by promoting and facilitating the orderly growth and development within the City of Holladay.***
- 2. The proposed amendment is consistent with goals, objectives and policies of the Highland Drive Master Plan.***
- 3. The proposed amendment is consistent with goals, objectives and policies of the General Plan.***
- 4. The proposed amendment is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity.***

5. *As zoning standards in the proposed zone are applied, the proposed amendment is not foreseen to adversely affect abutting properties.*
6. *The facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, such as, roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, storm water drainage systems, environmental hazard mitigation measures, water supply, and wastewater and refuse collection are adequate.*

Commissioner Fonte seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Fonte-No; Commissioner Tripeny- Yes; Commissioner Cunningham-Yes; Chair Roach-No. The motion passed with a vote of 5-to-2.

Commissioner Prince asked if there is a Planning Commission Meeting scheduled next week. Ms. Marsh reported that the next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled on May 5, 2026. There was discussion about the items on the next meeting agenda. There is a CUP application for an existing accessory building. The proposal is to convert the accessory building to an Accessory Dwelling Unit (“ADU”). In addition, there is a Site Plan on the next Planning Commission Meeting agenda. It was noted that there will also be half an hour of Planning Commission training.

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 7:58 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 28, 2026.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: June 2, 2026