

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

Tuesday, December 16, 2025

6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

4580 South 2300 East

Holladay, Utah

ATTENDANCE:

Planning Commission Members:

Dennis Roach, Chair

Karianne Prince

Angela Gong

Paul Cunningham

Brian Berndt

City Staff:

Carrie Marsh, City Planner

Jonathan Teerlink, Community and Economic
Development Director

Brad Christopherson, City Attorney

WORK SESSION

Chair Dennis Roach called the Work Session to order at 5:30 p.m. He noted that most of the Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioners Tripeny and Fonte. Two public hearings were scheduled on the Regular Meeting agenda with the approval of the Meeting Minutes listed as an Action Item. There were no Commissioner corrections for the Meeting Minutes from October 7, October 21, or October 28, 2025.

The first Public Hearing item on the Regular Meeting agenda was the “Hyde Accessory Building Footprint.” City Planner, Carrie Marsh, reported that this is a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) for property located at 2242 East Pheasant Way, which is located in the R-1-87 Zone. She emailed a correction to Commissioners because the request is not a Conditional Use as a Short-Term Rental, but an accessory building. The Planning Commission will look at the footprint size and the potential impacts on neighboring properties. The Site Plan is included in the Staff Report. This application meets the requirements for standard accessory building setbacks. The accessory building will not be used for dwelling purposes but exceeds the permitted size, which is the reason for the CUP. The Commission is asked to think about conditions that will address potential impacts.

Chair Roach noted that what is proposed is nearly triple the standard size for an accessory building. Ms. Marsh reported that the proposal is to add a new accessory building with a footprint of 3,702 square feet. This addition is in addition to an existing 749-square-foot detached guesthouse. The total footprint of the two accessory structures is 4,451 square feet, which exceeds the permitted accessory structure footprint of 1,400 square feet. It exceeds the amount allowed by 3,051 square feet. She clarified that this is not an extension of the existing detached guesthouse on the property.

Ms. Marsh reported that the Staff Report details lot coverage, because that can provide additional perspective on the structure coverage allowed on the property. The maximum lot coverage allowed for structures on a 2.09-acre (91,040 square feet) parcel is 20% of the total lot area or 18,208 square feet. She explained that the size of the primary structure is under 4,000 square feet.

Commissioner Prince noted that the size of a permitted accessory building is 1,400 square feet. She wanted to understand why the Commission would consider something much larger than what is allowed. Ms. Marsh explained that there are permitted and conditional uses. The intent of a conditional use is to provide additional oversight. This allows the Planning Commission to consider the potential impacts of a larger accessory building on the site. The code does not state that the permitted size is a hard line, but that anything over that amount might create impacts that need additional oversight. Conditional requests can be reviewed in a public setting.

Chair Roach mentioned Page 12 of the Meeting Materials Packet, which shows the lot coverage calculation and the tree canopy. Ms. Marsh stated that on the Site Plan, there are a lot of trees shown. Commissioners reviewed some of the submitted materials. The outside dashed line is the accessory building setback. One of the suggested Conditions of Approval is to have vegetation around that structure. Commissioner Paul Cunningham asked if the image shown is to scale, which was confirmed. Ms. Marsh reported that any trees removed during the construction of the structure will be required to be replaced somewhere on the site. Those trees would not have to be replaced in the exact same location, but somewhere on the property. Based on the Site Plan, it appears that there are plans for some vegetation in that location for screening purposes. It is possible to ask the applicant for additional information about the landscaping plans during the Regular Meeting.

Commissioner Brian Berndt asked if there is a recommendation from Staff about the mitigation of potential impacts. He wants to know how to properly mitigate the impact of an accessory building with a larger footprint. Ms. Marsh explained that the impacts would largely be visual but might also be related to sound. She does not anticipate there would be a significant amount of sound caused by the use. Commissioner Berndt stated that he would normally request a greater setback to mitigate the visual impacts, but in this case, it is proposed to be right against the setback line. Ms. Marsh confirmed that it is possible to consider a Condition of Approval for an increased setback. The Commission can also consider whether the visual impacts can be mitigated with plantings. The recommendations in the Staff Report relate to lighting and vegetation, which are fairly standard. However, it is also possible for the Commission to think about fence options.

Commissioner Prince wanted to know about parking. Ms. Marsh reported that there will need to be fire access to the structure. It either has to be fire sprinkled or have some sort of hard surface access that can withstand the weight of a fire truck. The Fire Marshal spoke to the applicant about that requirement, so there is an awareness that this requirement will need to be met. During the Building Permit process, there will be a check to ensure that it meets the requirements.

The second Public Hearing item on the Regular Meeting agenda is a Zone Map Amendment application. Ms. Marsh reported that this project has gone through a few noticing iterations. The first time, it was noticed for both parcels in the C-1 Zone. It was discovered that the C-1 Zone will not work with what is envisioned for the front portion of the project, which will have an office use. As a result, it was re-noticed with a request for the front parcel to be rezoned to the Professional Office (“PO”) Zone. The PO Zone has a 10,000 square foot minimum lot size requirement, so it will be noticed again for the next Planning Commission Meeting to involve both of the parcels.

When the applicant submitted their application, it was originally intended to include both parcels. However, based on the way the applicant wanted to use the existing house on the property, the

front parcel was considered for the PO Zone rather than both parcels. That does not work because of the minimum lot size, so both of the parcels need to be considered as part of the proposed rezone.

Commissioner Prince wanted to understand the rationale for presenting this to the Planning Commission at this time, since the item is not ready to be voted on. Ms. Marsh explained that it was noticed, and neighbors have submitted some public comments. It is possible to open the public hearing and listen to additional public comments. There will be another notice provided.

Ms. Marsh shared additional information about the property. It is located across from Macey's grocery store and is close to the intersection of 4500 South and Highland Drive. Jamie Walker is a local architect who has been wanting to have a new office. The property owner was approached with the idea of an office space on the front portion. The designs for the office are included in the Meeting Materials Packet for reference. Ms. Marsh explained that the intention is for the office to look like a house, but function as office space. It will be built to have accessible restrooms, accessible entrances, and adequate parking for the office use. The PO Zone pushes that structure closer to Highland Drive so the parking can be tucked behind. There is a canal on the front of the property that makes parking and development there a little more difficult.

Ms. Marsh reported that access to the site will be on the south side. The existing house on the site, which is on the rear parcel, will remain. She noted that there have been a few rezones to the PO Zone. The uses allowed in this zone are fairly low impact and include medical and dental. Typically, it involves a small office space where there are a few clients coming to the building. Chair Roach noted that the R-2-10 Zone does not allow for commercial, which was confirmed.

The Highland Drive Master Plan was reviewed. Ms. Marsh explained that it is broken down into three segments. The focus in this case is the northernmost segment, which is Segment A. Infill in this section is difficult and limited. There are not a lot of properties that have frontage directly onto Highland Drive. She noted that there are some office and commercial-type uses on the east side that are lower impact. There was discussion about different properties and zones in the area. Commissioner Angela Gong believed there is R-M interspersed throughout the stretch that is shown, but none of it is north of 4600. Ms. Marsh pointed out some of the properties zoned R-M.

Commissioner Cunningham noted that several of the email comments referred to a previous Planning Commission decision where a similar rezone was denied. He asked for additional information about that. Ms. Marsh clarified that the property owner was looking at a rezone and held a neighborhood meeting, but withdrew their application, so it never went to the Commission.

Ms. Marsh reported that this Public Hearing item will be continued until the next Planning Commission Meeting. She noted that the PO Zone is a middle ground between residential and the high-intensity commercial that is across the street. Chair Roach stated that he will share comments about this application during the Regular Meeting discussion. There were no additional questions.

Chair Roach closed the Work Session at 5:55 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 Commissioners are present with the exception of Commissioner Tripeny and Commissioner Fonte. There are two Public Hearing items and one Action Item. The Opening Statement was read aloud by Commissioner Gong.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **“Hyde Accessory Building Footprint” – Conditional Land Use Permit – 2242 East Pheasant Way (R-1-87 Zone) Review and Consideration of a Request by Applicant Jackson LeRoy, Representing Owner L. Hyde, for the Size of an Accessory Building Over the Permitted Footprint Size. Item Reviewed as an Administrative Application as per Provisions Stated in Holladay Ordinance §13.08.040. File #25-2-04**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a CUP application for 2242 East Pheasant Way, which is located in the R-1-87 Zone. She noted that the Staff Report has a typo in the Request line. It lists this as a Conditional Use as a Short-Term Rental, but this is a Conditional Use for an Accessory Building Footprint. There is no short-term rental associated with the item.

The property owner is proposing the addition of an accessory building, totaling 3,702 square feet, on the southeast corner of the property. There is another accessory building on the property. When the two accessory buildings are added together, the total is 4,451 square feet. This exceeds the permitted accessory structure footprint of 1,400 square feet. Since this proposal exceeds the amount allowed by 3,051 square feet, the request is before the Planning Commission. Ms. Marsh explained that the Commission can consider conditions to address potential impacts caused by the structure. The property size is 2.09 acres, and there is an allowance of structure coverage of 18,208 square feet. The existing home is approximately 3,600 square feet. The proposal is well below the total lot coverage amount, even with the proposed addition of an accessory building.

The proposed building meets the accessory building setbacks of 15 feet. Ms. Marsh explained that potential impacts associated with the accessory building include visual, noise, and nuisance-type impacts that are directly related to the size of the building. A structure of 1,400 square feet could be placed in the same location, but the Commission is asked to consider potential impacts from the increased size that has been proposed. Staff reviewed the application and location. Some Conditions of Approval are recommended, and those can be seen in the Staff Report. There is language related to compliance with the Lighting Ordinance passed a few months back. This will require dark sky-compliant fixtures to be in place. Additionally, lighting around the outside perimeter next to neighboring properties will be limited. The intention is to prevent lighting from crossing over into neighboring properties and for the lighting to meet the dark sky standards.

Ms. Marsh reported that the property should remain residential in appearance. The building would be required to meet Fire Code, so it has to maintain fire access or have fire sprinklers. She clarified that the Fire Marshal is involved in this review process. Graduated height keeps the structure low, and there is a limit of 20 feet in height. She noted that the proposed height is 18 feet. If there are any large sections of wall, those have to be broken up with architectural components. Other conditions that could be considered relate to vegetation, such as the placement of trees or shrubs.

Chair Roach noted that a 1,400-square-foot footprint is allowed. He asked if the existing accessory structure on the property is deducted from that amount, which was confirmed. Ms. Marsh explained that the 1,400 square feet permitted is an aggregate of all accessory buildings. Chair

Roach mentioned dark sky compliance. He does not imagine the structure will be built without windows on two sides, so he wanted to understand how this will be dark sky compliant. Ms. Marsh does not believe interior lighting is regulated by the Lighting Ordinance. There could be a Condition of Approval drafted related to lighting, such as having blinds that are closed at night. Fencing is another item that can be discussed with the applicant, such as a potential eight-foot fence.

The applicant representative, Michael Budge, explained that he is a landscape architect. Benn Brindley stated that he is with Jackson LeRoy, who will be the contractor building the structure. Mr. Budge shared presentation materials to address some of the comments made so far. He noted that during the first meeting with the client and architect, there was a discussion about an expansion to the home, where this use would be combined with that expansion. Ultimately, the client decided that it was too much and that there should be less of an impact on the property. Mr. Budge noted that there is a lot of existing vegetation on the site, so there have been surveys conducted to identify tree locations. In addition, there has been a 3D LiDAR scan done of the entire property. That allows them to see where the trunks of the trees are, as well as the heights of the trees on the site.

Mr. Budge shared a screenshot from the LiDAR scan and explained that this gives them the ability to study the site from all vantage points. He reported that the intention is to identify tree species that can be brought onto the site to screen the new structure. Mr. Budge next shared renderings that have been produced to illustrate the impact of the building on the property. There are no windows proposed on the south or east side of the property, so there are no concerns about light pollution. He noted that there is currently a row of existing evergreens that are approximately 17 feet tall. There are also existing pine trees that are 60 feet tall and some shade trees that are 40 feet tall. That is the reason for the proposed placement of the building, so it can be tucked into a corner where there is already a lot of existing vegetation. It has been strategically placed there.

Mr. Budge explained that the existing vegetation will be used for screening, but there will also be several additional trees planted. Additional images were shared with the Planning Commission. Chair Roach asked what type of exterior the building will have. Mr. Budge reported that it is still early in the process, but right now, there is a brick structure that is envisioned. He noted that this is part of the Dreyfous Farms Subdivision and the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (“CC&Rs”) have been reviewed. There is familiarity with the requirements in the subdivision.

Mr. Budge reported that this is intended to be used as a private office and is not a building that will be used for social events. He noted that there were some comments made about parking, but this is a solo occupancy structure that will primarily be used during the day. As a result, there is no need to allow vehicles to park next to the accessory building. It is not a public building in any way. The fire access and fire sprinkling options are still being considered at this time.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. He noted that there were three email comments received.

Commissioner Prince reported that there was a comment received from Jim Dreyfous referencing the subdivision and the constraints there, a comment from the Petron family expressing their concerns about the accessory building being closer to their primary residence than the owners of the new proposed structure. The third comment was Teri Miller who had concerns about other accessory buildings that have been built in the area and the precedent that will be set with this.

Jim Dreyfous gave his address as 5950 South 2300 East and explained that he lives to the south of the subject property. With the trees, it is possible to screen the accessory building, and there are no windows proposed on two sides of the building. He noted that the CC&Rs on the property are fairly strict, so he appreciates that those have been considered. Mr. Dreyfous stated that his only worry is the 15-foot setback because of the tree growth. Other than that, he does not have concerns, as long as there is dark sky compliance and the setback is taken into consideration.

Randall Paul gave his address as 2232 East Pheasant Way. He likes that there has been an openness in the area. Mr. Paul expressed support for the separation of the buildings that is planned.

David and Kristin Petron live at 5900 Brentwood Drive, which is immediately to the east of the applicant property. Mr. Petron explained that they have lived at this residence for 13 years and have never felt the need to come to a Planning Commission Meeting. Their property is immediately adjacent to the property line, and over that property line is Rocky Mountain Power. The new owner was aware of the restrictions when the property was purchased, but is asking for triple what is permitted for accessory buildings. Additionally, he noted that most of the trees are within 15 feet of the property line and would need to be removed for the construction of the accessory building.

Ms. Petron asked the Landscape Architect to clarify the existing evergreens that are planted. She wanted to understand if the evergreen trees referenced are the ones on their property. It does not make sense for there to be screening assumptions based on vegetation outside the subject property. Mr. Petron took a moment to reiterate his concerns about the trees and the setbacks. Mr. and Mrs. Petron have issues with the proposed size and the location of the accessory structure.

Leonard Hyde explained that he is the applicant. He wanted to share some clarifying information with those present. The property has been studied with the intention of having a minimal impact on the neighbors. Even with this proposal, the total lot coverage is low. He pointed out that his neighbors to the rear have lot coverage that is over 20%. Mr. Hyde reiterated that there has been a lot of study conducted, and the intention has been to minimize the impact. This includes keeping the building low and not having windows on certain sides. It will be a low-impact project.

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

Chair Roach asked the applicant representatives to address the comments made during the public hearing. Mr. Budge clarified that there will not be a reliance on the evergreens mentioned by the Petron family. The evergreens are currently 17 feet tall, so there is some assistance with screening, but the plan is to have enough trees to provide screening between the structure and the property line. There is an understanding of the power lines that exist. In addition, the 15-foot setback that was mentioned will provide enough room for the planting that will screen the building completely.

Chair Roach noted that there have been suggestions to increase the setback to the property line, with the setback at 18 or 20 feet instead of 15 feet. Mr. Budge explained that this would change the design. He reiterated that there has been a lot of study conducted and this was determined to be the best location. The location will tuck the accessory building into the existing vegetation.

Commissioner Cunningham asked about the power line issue that was mentioned. He wanted to know if this would impact what is planned. Mr. Budge denied this and explained that the power lines are right over the property line. The trees that are planned will work in the area, and no issues are envisioned. Commissioner Berndt asked about a section shown on the aerial image. It was clarified that this was a playground structure that has since been removed. It was 16 feet tall, and the accessory building is proposed to be 18 feet tall, so it is not much taller than that structure.

Commissioner Berndt asked Staff about lot coverage. Community and Economic Development Director, Jonathan Teerlink, reported that there is total lot coverage amount, which includes structures and impervious surfaces, but the code further defines accessory buildings and uses to be no more than a certain footprint size to ensure these are accessory uses to the primary use.

Commissioner Berndt wanted to know how large the accessory uses are compared to the primary use. Ms. Marsh clarified that the code language that states accessory buildings must be smaller than the primary structure is only applicable to properties half an acre or smaller. On larger properties, it is possible to have an accessory building aggregation that totals more than the primary.

Commissioner Gong believed the question before the Planning Commission is whether impacts from the proposed accessory building can be reasonably mitigated. Ms. Marsh stated that the Commission can think about whether the impacts of the building size can be reasonably mitigated.

Commissioner Prince asked about graduated height when it comes to accessory buildings. Ms. Marsh shared information about graduated height. There is not an issue with graduated height in this case, because the building is already pushed back from the property line. There can be graduated height issues when there is a 20-foot-tall accessory building 5 feet from the property line. The proposed building is naturally controlled by the setbacks on a property this size.

Commissioner Cunningham expressed concerns about the size of the proposed accessory building. He wanted to know if there would be clients coming to the office or if there would be meetings held. There is no clarity about the rationale for an office space the size of what has been proposed. Ms. Marsh pointed out that there is a proposed Condition of Approval that mentions a Home Occupation Business License. Those concerns would be addressed through that process. Accessory buildings are allowed to be used for a home occupation, so if clients were coming to the property to meet in the main building or accessory buildings, a Home Occupation Business License would be required. At that time, the site, use, and number of clients would be considered.

Chair Roach appreciates that a lot of thought has been put into this application. It appears the applicant is genuinely concerned about reducing the impact on neighboring properties. That being said, he would like to see tree mitigation and preservation techniques used. He suggested that the motion language reference the International Society of Arboriculture (“ISA”) standards for tree protection zones. It is necessary that certain steps be taken to ensure there is protection.

Commissioner Prince asked the applicant representatives to share comments about fencing and fence height. Mr. Budge reported that the intention is to leave the fence to the south that separates this property. The fence on the east is completely concealed with vegetation. Commissioner Prince wanted to know the current fence height. Mr. Budge stated that it is 6 feet in height.

Commissioner Gong noted that the renderings were helpful when visualizing what this project would look like but thought it might be optimistic to have the trees, as rendered, in the 15-foot space. Chair Roach pointed out that it will depend on the width of the columnar trees. Mr. Budge explained that 15 feet is more than adequate for the species that have been contemplated. Chair Roach asked if the Conditions of Approval include language about the evergreens. Ms. Marsh clarified that those trees have not been listed specifically, but certain language can be added.

Commissioner Prince is interested in considering a taller fence, at least on the east side. Commissioner Gong believed that would be a decision made between the property owners, but there could be a Condition of Approval requiring there to be a discussion about this possibility.

Mr. Christopherson shared information about CUPs. He reported that conditional uses result in an extra layer of review. For this application, the Planning Commission has considered the potential impacts of the accessory building footprint, such as lighting and screening. For a CUP, the anticipated detrimental effects must be mitigated. He clarified that the language does not state the effects must be eliminated. It was noted that property owners have certain property rights.

Ms. Marsh read the following language: “Conditions or complaints found to be in violation of set standards will require re-review by the Planning Commission or possible revocation of the permit, as determined by the Community Development Director.” If there is a significant change in the conditions, complaints can be made, and the City can address the situation accordingly.

Commissioner Berndt asked if it might make sense to move the accessory building further into the property. Chair Roach confirmed that it is an option to move the building in more, but his concern is that this will result in an increased height. Commissioner Gong stated that the 15-foot setback seems small to her, but she acknowledged that the impacts are mitigated. Commissioner Berndt wondered whether it might make sense to direct the applicant to work with the neighbors to see if there is a solution that will satisfy everyone. Commissioner Prince does not know that there is a rationale for the Planning Commission directing that the setback be more than 15 feet. Commissioner Cunningham wanted to review the utility right-of-way for the power lines. Ms. Marsh reported that it is usually 10 feet on either side when there are utility rights-of-way in place.

Additional discussions were had about setbacks. Ms. Marsh reported that there are some sections that are at 15 feet and other sections that are further away, which increases the average. The average setback on the east side is likely closer to 20 feet. The average setback on the south side is likely between 16 and 18 feet. She reiterated that there are some parts that are further away. Chair Roach asked if the Commission's concern is related to the east side or the south side. Commissioner Prince explained that her concern has to do with the east side. Commissioner Berndt does not care about the average in this case. He wants to make sure there is the greatest possibility that the trees planted there will survive and that the trees also provide screening.

Mr. Christopherson reported that in order for this application to be approved, there will need to be at least four positive votes. He noted that two members of the Planning Commission are absent.

Chair Roach moved to APPROVE the Conditional Use Permit application by Jackson LeRoy, representing property owner L. Hyde, for an accessory building footprint of 3,702 square feet, located at 2242 East Pheasant Way in the R-1-87 Zone, based upon the following findings:

- 1. The property is within the R-1-87 Zone and totals 2.09 acres.*
- 2. A primary residential use has been established on the property.*
- 3. Accessory uses include accessory buildings and uses that are customarily incidental to the permitted residential use.*
- 4. The total accessory structure footprint on the property is over 1,400 square feet.*
- 5. Accessory structures on lots over a half-acre can be larger than the primary structure.*
- 6. The proposed structure is not a guesthouse or accessory dwelling unit.*
- 7. The addition of the proposed accessory structure is within the allowed lot coverage.*
- 8. The proposed accessory structure meets the 15-foot setback requirement for accessory structures.*

This is based on the following conditions:

- 1. Property to retain its appearance as a residential unit.*
- 2. Accessory structure to comply with all zoning standards, including height, massing and scale, setbacks, graduated height, lot coverage, and lighting.*
- 3. A Building Permit is required for construction of the structure.*
- 4. All trees removed by the placement of the accessory structure and any hard surfaces associated with it are to be replaced with an equivalent canopy at maturity.*
- 5. Vegetation, including trees or tall shrubs, to be planted in the rear and side setbacks against neighboring properties. There must be ISA tree zone protection standards throughout construction, including watering as needed in the summer months. There must be a use of evergreen and deciduous landscape so there is year-round cover.*
- 6. A Home Occupation Business License is required if clients associated with a business visit the property.*

7. ***Conditions or complaints found to be in violation of set standards will require re-review by the Planning Commission or possible revocation of this permit as determined by the Community Development Director.***

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

The Planning Commission took a short break before hearing the next agenda item.

2. **Zone Map Amendment – Rezone from R-2-10 to PO - 4545 South Highland Drive Review and Recommendation to City Council on a Proposal by Applicant Jamie Walker, Representing Property Owner, Matthew Michalis, to Amend the Holladay Zone Map at this Location from the Current, Residential, Two-Family Zone (R-2-10) to the Professional Office Zone (PO) for Approximately 0.14 acres of Property. Item Reviewed as Legislative Action, According to Procedures set forth in Holladay Ordinance §13.07. File #25-4-10.**

Ms. Marsh presented the Staff Report and explained that this item is an application for a Zone Map Amendment. She reported that this item will be continued because it will involve two parcels instead of one parcel. Originally, there were two parcels involved, but it was determined that the front parcel would be the focus instead. The item was re-noticed. The current public hearing is for the front parcel. As this was being reviewed, it was determined that the front parcel does not meet the qualifications for the PO Zone based on lot size. It will be noticed again for both parcels.

The property is located at 4545 South Highland Drive, and the rear property is 4555 South Highland Drive. Ms. Marsh reported that the request is from a local architect, Jamie Walker. The idea is to have an architecture office located on the property, but it is a difficult site to redevelop. The previous property owner went through a subdivision process so a residential structure could be located on each of the lots. The challenge with building a house on the front parcel and having a Home Occupation use there has to do with incorporating an office or commercial use into a home. The more preferable option for the applicant was to design a structure that was intended to be used as office space from the beginning. There are some designs to indicate what the structure is proposed to look like. The intention is to make it look residential so it blends in with the surrounding residential development. The PO Zone was selected because of the setbacks on the front that bring the structure closer to the street. Additionally, parking would be located behind.

The house on the rear parcel is intended to remain in place. Ms. Marsh reported that this property has direct frontage onto Highland Drive. She noted that the property falls within Segment A of the Highland Drive Master Plan. It recognizes that infill opportunities are limited and suggests new zoning patterns. Segment A has a mixture of uses primarily commercial and multi-family residential developments. Ms. Marsh shared additional information about the Highland Drive Master Plan. During the Work Session, there was discussion about the historic nature of the Salt Lake County zoning, which had multi-family residential blended with office use. The PO Zone took the residential component out to create a separate zone, but those historically co-existed.

There are some elements from the newly adopted General Plan that are referenced in the Staff Report, specifically a walkable and connected community and a strong local economy. Ms. Marsh

outlined the redevelopment standards, as this comes with a future application for redevelopment on the front of the parcel. There are slightly smaller setbacks in the front than there would be with residential development, but the PO Zone does take buffering from residential zones into account. Next to residential zones, there has to be an increased setback. The driveway that is in place is on the south side of the property, so that puts an automatic 20-foot setback between the development on the south side. On the north side, the driveway for the condominiums reduces some of the impact because there are no residential dwellings right next to the proposed structure.

Ms. Marsh reiterated that there is an existing house on the rear property that will be preserved. The PO Zone allows for more separation between the existing home and the proposed structure. Commissioner Prince asked about the canal that was mentioned in the Staff Report. Ms. Marsh reported that the canal is underground and is on the front of the property, within the first 15 feet. There cannot be a parking lot built into the canal area, but the PO Zone allows a shift where the parking lot can be tucked behind. Commissioner Berndt asked if it is possible to have residential uses in the PO Zone. Ms. Marsh explained that residential is a conditional use. If both of the parcels are rezoned to PO, the applicant would come back for a conditional use for the residential. Another possibility is to look at a historical designation that would preserve the existing home.

David George thanked Staff for summarizing the process that has taken place so far. He clarified that he owns the property in the back, and Matthew Michalis owns the property in the front. Mr. Michalis and Jamie Walker want to build a house on the front, but were unable to attend the Planning Commission Meeting. He shared information about the canal in the area.

Chair Roach opened the public hearing. He noted that some email comments were received.

Commissioner Prince reported that there were comments received from Patricia Traven, Tom and Ellen Mitchell, and Doug Wolf, who all expressed opposition to the proposed rezone.

Ellen Mitchell gave her address as 4553 South Highland Drive. She explained that if the property in front is rezoned and it becomes a commercial property, there are concerns that the property behind it will also become commercial. She would like to see this remain residential.

Mr. Christopherson provided clarification and noted that CUPs are not the same as rezones. No one is entitled to a rezone. He reported that this property is currently zoned R-2. If someone asks for a rezone, there is no guarantee that the rezone will be granted. The Planning Commission makes a recommendation, and then the City Council makes the final decision on the rezone request.

Ms. Marsh took a moment to summarize the comments that were received ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. The comments came from residential neighbors adjacent to this property, and there were concerns about traffic, safety, and the potential impacts of this commercial-type use. Chair Roach reminded those present that this rezone item will be continued to the next meeting. The next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled to take place on January 6, 2025.

Doug Wolf gave his address as 1819 East Cottonwood Glen Court. He submitted a written comment ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting and hopes it will be taken into consideration. He is one of the original homeowners on Cottonwood Glen, as he built there 24 years ago. There

is disappointment about having to readdress the zoning. In 2022, residents came out and expressed their opinions, asking the area to remain residential. This property is surrounded by residential and this is a close neighborhood. None of the residents want to see a commercial use in the center of this residential area. The commercial uses that currently exist are much further south.

Eugene Zanolli gave his address as 1835 East Cottonwood Glen Court and explained that this proposal would change the neighborhood. He does not believe this would be harmonious with what currently exists and pointed out the proximity to the road. No matter how attractive the commercial building might be, it will impact the overall willingness to purchase property in the area. Mr. Zanolli shared information about existing traffic issues and expressed concerns about the proposal. Approving the rezone would change the nature of the residential neighborhood. He noted that if the property is rezoned to PO and is sold in the future, there are many other uses that would also be permitted. The proposal impacts the neighborhood, traffic, and property values.

There were no further comments. The public hearing remained open.

Commissioner Prince moved to CONTINUE the application by Jamie Walker to amend the City of Holladay Zoning Map for property located at 4545 South Highland Drive so the application can include 4555 South Highland Drive, to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Cunningham-Yes; Commissioner Berndt-Yes; Commissioner Gong-Yes; Commissioner Prince-Yes; Chair Roach-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Approval of Minutes – October 7, 21, and 28, 2025.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from October 7, 2025. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from October 21, 2025. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Commissioner Prince moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from October 28, 2025. Commissioner Gong seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

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 7:41 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, December 16, 2025.

Teri Forbes

Teri Forbes
T Forbes Group
Minutes Secretary

Minutes Approved: February 17, 2026