

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

Tuesday, January 6, 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

Brian Berndt

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

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. There is one Continued Public Hearing on the Regular Meeting agenda and one Action Item. He reported that the City Attorney is not present at the Planning Commission Meeting, but it is possible to contact him by phone if necessary. The Action Item on the agenda is Meeting Minutes from June 24, 2025, and December 2, 2025. It was noted that there is a reference to Chair Roach in the Meeting Minutes from June 24, 2025, that needs to be removed.

The Continued Public Hearing is for a Zone Map Amendment for property at 4545 South, 4555 South, and 4559 South Highland Drive. City Planner, Carrie Marsh, reported that at the last meeting, there was information provided and there were public comments made. The Planning Commission continued the public hearing. Some new comments have been submitted and those were all sent to the Commissioners. Those will be read into the record during the Regular Meeting.

Ms. Marsh reviewed the updated Staff Report and explained that three parcels are included. She explained that there was a subdivision of a single parcel into two parcels. The total size of the property is approximately 16,000 square feet. There is enough land area in the R-2 Zone to do an attached unit with two units and one single. The current property owner has submitted plans for a house on the front parcel. She discussed the difference between the R-2 Zone and the P-O Zone. The footprint would be approximately the same. The side setbacks would be the same between the two zones, but the rear setbacks would be increased to buffer against the residential areas.

The Staff Report discusses the P-O Zone and explains that the zone was created as a replacement for the mixed-use zone that existed under Salt Lake County. In that zone, business, professional offices, and multi-family development co-existed. There are a lot of examples in the City where there are professional offices located near single-family homes or multi-family developments. Ms. Marsh explained that it is fairly common to have office spaces next to residential uses.

City of Holladay Planning Commission Meeting – 01/06/2026

One of the main purposes of the P-O Zone is to create more buffering against residential zones. It is intended to pull the office uses out, allow a few more common uses, and increase standards to buffer against residential properties. Ms. Marsh reported that many of the public comments so far have been about the impacts on residential properties. The Staff Report includes information about signage, lighting, screening, and landscaping. She explained that there are standards in the P-O Zone specifically designed to reduce impacts on neighboring residential properties.

Chair Roach asked if there are three properties associated with this application. Ms. Marsh reported that this is divided into three parcels. She believes the County created the third driveway parcel because the plat shows it as two separate lots. The application is for all three of the parcels listed. 4545 is the front lot, 4555 is the back lot, and 4559 is the driveway. The plat shows two lots, with the driveway access area included in the front lot. There is uncertainty about why the County separated it out and made it a separate parcel, but it might be for taxing reasons.

Commissioner Paul Cunningham mentioned the General Plan and asked if there was a change made in that area. Ms. Marsh reported that the Highland Drive Small Area Master Plan was created in 2017. She shared information about the General Plan update and the details in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Cunningham pointed out that the application is for a Zone Map Amendment and not a Building Permit. He wanted to know if a neighborhood meeting was required to be held. Ms. Marsh reported that neighborhood meetings are required for subdivisions, rezones, and Planned Unit Developments (“PUD”). Commissioner Cunningham stated that the neighborhood meeting notes are incomplete and do not mention who was there, where it was located, or the time that the meeting was held. There is a list of five items that were discussed. He wondered whether there was additional documentation. Ms. Marsh stated that these are the notes that were submitted.

Chair Roach asked about the Highland corridor and whether there have been spot zone changes there in the last five to 10 years. Ms. Marsh reported that generally, along Highland Drive, the existing offices are rezoning to P-O. Some properties have a more commercial use, such as the daycare. Other properties have retained R-M Zone. She shared information about a previous rezone application that was submitted in the area. There are a lot of existing uses that have either not needed to rezone or have rezoned to P-O. Additional discussions were had about previous rezones in the area. Ms. Marsh explained that the General Plan identifies Highland Drive as an area where there will be a transition seen over time. Uses that were appropriate in the past when Highland Drive was a lower-impact road might not continue to be as appropriate in the future.

Commissioner Patrick Tripeny asked if there was an application for an earlier zone change, which was denied. Ms. Marsh believed the property owner considered it and held a neighborhood meeting, but then made a determination to explore other options. The P-O Zone has specific references to the Highland Drive Master Plan in it, so when property owners come to Staff, there is a code review conducted, and information is provided. The property owner can then make a decision about whether to submit an application. Commissioner Jill Fonte asked what would happen if the property was rezoned and it remained residential. Ms. Marsh confirmed that residential uses are allowed within the P-O Zone. However, there would need to be a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) obtained. She explained that a CUP request would need to come to the City.

Commissioner Brian Berndt referenced the Staff Report and asked about compatibility with the surrounding residential properties. Ms. Marsh explained that there is a specific reference made to the zoning code. In the Rezone Proposal Analysis section of the Staff Report, it outlines 13.44.010B. The document details the purpose of the P-O Zone and states that it is intended to be compatible with abutting residential uses. It is also to buffer residential development or zones from more intense land uses. Commissioner Berndt asked about the setbacks. Ms. Marsh reported that in this case, it would change the front setback from 25 feet to 10 feet in order to bring structures closer to the road. It would also increase rear setbacks from 20 feet to 30 feet. The side setbacks would remain the same. The P-O Zone also requires there to be a specific amount of landscaping. There are additional standards in the P-O Zone, which can be seen on Page 6 of the Staff Report. Information about parking in the P-O Zone was shared. Ms. Marsh explained that parking cannot be in the front setback, and parking lot areas must be screened from the residential properties.

Chair Roach closed the Work Session at 5:58 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. There is one Continued Public Hearing and one Action Item included on the Regular Meeting agenda. The Opening Statement was read aloud by Commissioner Tripeny.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Zone Map Amendment – Rezone from R-2-10 to P-O - 4545 South, 4555 South, and 4559 South Highland Drive. Continued Review and Recommendation to City Council on a Proposal by Applicants Jamie Walker and David George, Representing Property Owners Matthew Michalis and David George to Amend the Holladay Zone Map at this Location from the Current, Residential, Two-Family Zone (R-2-10) to the Professional Office Zone (P-O) for Approximately 0.36 acres of Property, Consisting of Two Lots and a Driveway Access Parcel. Item Reviewed as Legislative Action, According to Procedures set forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07.**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Zone Map Amendment request for property located at 4545 South, 4555 South, and 4559 South Highland Drive. There are three parcels involved in this rezone application, and the request is to rezone from the existing R-2 Zone to the P-O Zone. The total lot area is 0.36 acres, and the square footage listed in the Staff Report is 15,681 square feet. The surveyed area on the plat for the subdivision is slightly over 16,000 square feet. In the existing zone, there is enough land for two attached homes and one single home. Ms. Marsh reported that there is one existing single house on the rear side of the property.

The applicant is seeking a zone change to the P-O Zone, which is in line with the guidance in Segment A of the Highland Drive Master Plan. The rezone request is primarily to enable the development of the front parcel so it can serve as a small office space for a local architect. The rear parcel is involved in this application as well, which would enable the existing home to be used as permitted office space. Alternatively, it could continue to be used for residential purposes if there was a CUP approved by the Planning Commission. The property owner is interested in potentially seeking a historical designation to preserve the rear house, which was built in the 1940s.

The traffic is primarily on Highland Drive, and access does not go through any other neighborhoods. After speaking to the Fire Marshal, it was recommended that there be a fire turnaround so access on the site is improved for emergency situations. Ms. Marsh explained that this would also enable those visiting the site to have an easier route back onto Highland Drive.

The Staff Report highlights the Highland Drive Master Plan and also reviews the General Plan. Ms. Marsh pointed out that the General Plan had significant public input and was reviewed by the Planning Commission last year. There is also information about the P-O Zone in the Staff Report. She explained that the purpose of the P-O Zone is to be compatible with adjacent and abutting residential zones. Additionally, the intention is to further buffer the residential zones from potential impacts associated with a more intense land use. The two newest developments on either side of the applicant property are PUDs with private road access. Ms. Marsh reported that the heights in the R-2 Zone and P-O Zone are relatively similar, but the P-O Zone allows for 40 feet. Based on the information submitted by the applicant, there is no intention to have something on the property that reaches the maximum of 40 feet, but that is what is allowed within the P-O Zone.

Ms. Marsh reported that there is a Technical Review Committee (“TRC”) recommendation outlined in the Staff Report, as well as some Consideration Standards. The Staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the Zoning Map. There are findings included in the Staff Report as well as model motion language.

Discussions were had about the area and access. Commissioner Karianne Prince asked if the three structures directly to the east of this parcel are accessed from Highland Drive, which was confirmed. Ms. Marsh reported that the applicant submitted an evaluation of the proposed setback. The applicant also sent images of the Highland Drive streetscape to better illustrate the scale.

The applicant, David George, introduced himself to the Planning Commission and reviewed some of the images that were submitted. There is a multi-family on one side and commercial on the other side. Mr. George shared background information about the request and noted that Jamie Walker has been a local architect for some time. He offered to answer additional Commissioner questions.

Chair Roach believed that on both sides of the property, there are PUDs in place, which was confirmed. Ms. Marsh clarified that those do not front onto Highland Drive. The Highland Drive side is a side yard, so the requirements are met for the side yard there, but those rear yards were reduced from the standards in the R-2 Zone. Commissioner Cunningham asked about the neighborhood meeting that was held and the notes that were submitted. Mr. George reported that there were five attendees at the meeting, including two residents. One resident was in favor of the proposal and one was opposed. He noted that the P-O Zone is more restrictive than the R-2 Zone. He would not normally move to a P-O Zone, but it would allow Mr. Walker to be located there.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. He noted that some email comments were received ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Prince reported that seven emails were received. She will state who the email comment was from, as well as a summary of the comment.

Eugene Zanolli is the Acting President of the Cottonwood Glen Homeowners Association (“HOA”) and expressed opposition to the proposed zone change due to the impact on the

neighborhood and the absence of information. There was also an email comment from the Mitchell Family, who live to the east and are opposed to the rezone. There were concerns about traffic congestion and property values. The third email comment was from Nicole Valenzuela, and she was also in opposition to the rezone due to concerns about how this would impact her household. Serra and Braydon Nemelka submitted an email comment in opposition to the rezone, as there are concerns about what impact professional office use would have on overall property values. There was also an email comment from Douglas Wolf. He was also opposed to the rezone. There were concerns about property values and traffic issues. He mentioned a desire to preserve the residential quality. In addition, there was a comment from Sharon Kirby Butler, who is opposed to the rezone due to concerns about traffic, negative visual impacts, and overall impacts to property values.

Ellen Mitchell reported that at the last meeting, it was stated that all of the emails submitted prior to that meeting would be available for this meeting. Commissioner Prince reported that the Planning Commission saw the emails that came in for the December meeting, and those were included in the public record at that time. Chair Roach stated that if a public comment was made during the last meeting, it is still part of the public record and does not need to be reiterated.

Doug Wolf gave his address as 1819 East Cottonwood Glen Court. He asked to discuss a map in greater detail with the Commission and pointed out 4500 South. Everything shown in pink is residential and the applicant property is outlined in yellow. The applicant property is surrounded by twin homes that are luxury properties. It does not make sense to have a commercial or professional use in the middle of residential properties. There are four different condominium associations and the Commission will hear from representatives from each, but there is united opposition. Mr. Wolf reported that there is a desire for the neighborhood to remain residential.

Serra Lakomski Nemelka gave her address as 1793 Bermondsey Court. Her community was not made aware of the neighborhood meetings. There would have been representation if there was awareness of those meetings. She pointed out that what is proposed would be a spot zone that is inappropriate for the area, given the surrounding residential uses. There is a section of the General Plan that states any changes to the current zoning patterns should be considered only if the new zoning will enhance existing uses. The proposal will not enhance the residential neighborhood.

Ellen Mitchell gave her address as 4553 South Highland Drive and explained that she lives behind the subject property. Her area will be most impacted by the traffic, car pollution, and noise. This was built in 1985 and it was set back off of Highland Drive for security and safety reasons. There is no desire to have a business in front of her home and to see the traffic levels increase.

Bradley Katz gave his address as 1811 East Cottonwood Glen Court and explained that he lives adjacent to the parcel that is being considered. He asked the Planning Commission not to approve the proposed rezone to the P-O Zone. This neighborhood was designed and zoned as residential for a reason. Families chose the area for the quiet character and sense of community, which could be lost if there is a rezone to P-O. He worries about the precedent this rezone could set. If the Planning Commission approves this change, it sends a signal that the rights and expectations of homeowners are secondary to development interests. That undermines trust in zoning as a tool to protect neighborhoods. The west side of Highland Drive is already commercial, but the east side has always been residential. He asked that the integrity of the neighborhood be preserved.

Morris Seeley gave his address as 1823 East Cottonwood Glen Court. Holladay has always been focused on community, and the same is true in this area. Retaining this area as residential supports that focus. If there is a desire to have a commercial space nearby, it is possible to look across the street, where there are developed lots with open space available for the proposed commercial use.

Eugene Zanolli reported that all of the surrounding communities are present at the Planning Commission Meeting. There appears to be a consensus that there is a desire to maintain residential uses in the area. No one in his community heard about the neighborhood meeting that was held. He believed that everyone within 500 feet of the development needed to be noticed and the attendees needed to be recorded, but that did not appear to happen. Mr. Zanolli pointed out that there have not been a lot of details provided, and it is difficult to support a rezone without those.

Mr. Zanolli spoke to four different real estate agents and asked for their opinion on property values. Two were neutral, and two were negative. One of the real estate agents who had a negative opinion lives in the community. He asked the Commission to consider the impacts to real estate values.

Mike Duffy gave his address at 4591 South Holladay Farm Lane and echoed previous comments.

Patricia Trathen gave her address as 4553 South Highland Drive and also echoed the comments.

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

Chair Roach understands the intention behind the Highland Drive Small Area Master Plan. That being said, he does not necessarily want to see this move forward based on the public comment and location of the applicant property. Commissioner Prince agrees that it does not fit in with this block of residential. It does not seem to fit with the character of the neighborhood and she is not convinced the rezone needs to happen at this time. Chair Roach explained that he is also considering the long-term impact of a rezone. Commissioner Tripeny had a similar initial reaction to this proposal, but after visiting the neighborhood, he did not see a neighborhood with four communities. He saw four individual communities rather than the united residential community that has been described. There are walls and locked gates, and he does not find a larger community there. He does not see that the proposed rezone would be detrimental to the area.

Commissioner Fonte stated that she lives in a gated community and has never found more of a sense of community than she has behind those gates. The fact that there are four separate communities does not necessarily impact her view of the broader community. She understands the residents do not want a commercial structure in the middle of these neighborhoods. In addition, she agrees with Chair Roach that this might not be the most appropriate location for a rezone.

Commissioner Cunningham does not believe it is an appropriate time for a rezone in this location. Commissioner Berndt is not sure that anything on the property will necessarily blend in with the existing neighborhoods. All infill development is difficult, so he thought about whether the P-O Zone would provide the necessary buffers and setbacks. He believes the comments about increased traffic are misleading because Highland Drive is the busiest road in the area. He wished it was possible to see the development that is envisioned, but that is typically not done with a rezone. The proposal would likely eliminate a lot of concerns. He expressed support for the rezone.

Chair Roach asked about the Tree Ordinance. Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, reported that street trees would be difficult on Highland Drive due to the canal location. Ms. Marsh discussed PUDs in the area. Chair Roach wanted to clarify the differences between the R-2 Zone and the P-O Zone. Ms. Marsh reported that there is not enough land area for a PUD in this case. The neighboring properties were PUDs and have reduced standards that might have been more impactful on this property. Commissioner Prince asked about the front parcel that touches directly on Highland Drive. At one point, it was somewhat heavily wooded, and she wondered what the requirements for that property would be in the future. Mr. Teerlink explained that there would be a discussion with the property owner about that in the future.

Commissioner Angela Gong feels similarly to Commissioner Berndt. The P-O Zone can be a low-impact commercial zone. She discussed the larger context and pointed out that this particular stretch of Highland Drive is intense and the use is currently checkered along that stretch. Commissioner Gong stated that it makes sense to have a low-impact commercial use in this area. The contrast of the use is not as apparent if the Commission looks at the area more broadly.

Chair Roach stated that this is a residential area of Holladay. Ms. Marsh shared comments about the general pattern of zoning and rezones. She discussed Highland Drive when it was a much smaller roadway, and there was no commercial development on the other side. The use changed over time. Discussions were had about a potential motion for the rezone application. Ms. Marsh reported that a recommendation from the Planning Commission will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration. The City Council will make the final decision on the rezone application.

Commissioner Gong noted that the applicant stated there was a neighborhood meeting held and attendance was low. However, during the public comment period, there were comments about not receiving notice for the neighborhood meeting. She asked if there was documentation. Ms. Marsh discussed the notices sent out for Planning Commission Meetings. Commissioner Prince expressed concern that neighbors stated notice was not received for the neighborhood meeting.

Commissioner Prince moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council to DENY an application by Jamie Walker and David George to amend the City of Holladay Zoning Map for 0.36 acres of land, located at 4545 South, 4555 South, and 4559 South Highland Drive, based upon the following finding:

- 1. The proposed amendment is not harmonious with the abutting properties and would adversely affect the overall character of the existing residential neighborhood on the east side of Highland Drive.***

Commissioner Fonte seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Berndt-No; Commissioner Gong-No; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Commissioner Fonte-Yes; Commissioner Tripeny-No; Commissioner Cunningham-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed.

ACTION ITEMS

- 2. Approval of Minutes – June 24, 2025 and December 2, 2025.**

Chair Roach moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from June 24, 2025, as amended. Commissioner Prince seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Roach moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from December 2, 2025. Commissioner Tripeny seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

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 6:58 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, January 6, 2026.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: February 17, 2026