

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 23, 2024
Regular Meeting – 6:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

Attendance-

Planning Commission

Cindy Wilkey – Chair
Don Russell – Vice Chair
Don Quigley
Lynette Wendel
Gordon Willardson
David Wright
David Young – (Alternate)

Community Development Staff

Terryne Bergeson – Planner
Jamie Brooks, City Recorder
Wayne Harper – Econ/Comm Dev. Dir.
Kim Horiuchi – Communications Dir.
Mark McGrath – Long Range Planner
Jim Spung – Senior Planner

Excused: Commissioner Marc McElreath

Citizens/Guests Present: Todd Barker, J. Cromer, Ernest Burgess, Jana Elder, Elsa Elizondo, Clarence Fields, Nancy B. Fields, Michelle Frew, Bob Knudsen, Teresa Martinez, Johnny Prettyman, Dennis Sanok, Meg Townsend, Matthew Wheeler, S. Wiggins, David Vernon, Diane Wright, and Michael Wright

Chair Cindy Wilkey opened the general meeting at 6:03 p.m. before reading the welcome statement.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Review/Approval of the Minutes for the April 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to approve the minutes of the April 9, 2024 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Willardson.

Commissioner Russell: AYE
Commissioner Wilkey: ABSTAIN
Commissioner Wright: AYE
Commissioner Quigley: AYE
Commissioner Wendel: ABSTAIN

Commissioner McElreath: ABSENT


Commissioner Willardson: AYE

Commissioner Young: AYE

Motion passes 5-0

OTHER MATTERS

- | |
|--|
| 2. Public Hearing and Planning Commission Review of the Taylorsville Expressway Station Area Master Plan (1G24 / Mark McGrath, Long-Range Planner) |
|--|

 Mark McGrath provided some brief background information regarding the topic at hand. He pointed out the tremendous growth that Utah and more specifically Salt Lake County had experienced and would continue to experience. The current housing crisis would get much worse with the increased growth which had prompted the Utah Legislature to attempt to address the situation. HB462 from 2020 was now law, and it required that any “municipality that has a fixed guideway public transit station located within the municipality’s boundaries shall, for the station area:

- i. Develop and adopt a station area plan; and
- ii. Adopt appropriate land use regulations to implement the station area plan.

The Mid-Valley Connector Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) System that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) would soon be building meant that Taylorsville would need to create such a plan for three BRT stations—what would be the 1300 West Station, the Atherton West Station, and the Riverboat Road Station.

The new statute was an attempt to address transportation and housing, as well as the relationship between the two. It identified four plan objectives which were to:

- Increase the availability and affordability of housing, including moderate income housing
- Promote sustainable environmental conditions
- Enhance access to opportunities (i.e. education and employment)
- Increase transportation choices

McGrath explained that the City had created a “3% strategy.” The idea was that although it was recognized that there would be significant growth throughout the region and specifically in Taylorsville, residents did not want to see the neighborhoods of single-family residences impacted. Therefore, the goal was to focus Taylorsville’s growth on a handful of locations that made sense—those near mass-transit, etc. that were essentially 3% of the city’s footprint. The area to be discussed that evening was one of those locations.

Mr. McGrath then turned the time over to Robert Weaver of KGRW & Associates and Bob Northfield of BCT Design Group.

Mr. Weaver explained that they were joined by Erin Talkington of RCL Co. who would provide real estate and economic analysis and strategies. Also presenting would be Andy Hubbard of Great Basin Engineering who would speak to the infrastructure needs of such a plan.

Mr. Weaver explained that developing the plan was a four-part process. Phase I was information-gathering which involved speaking with various stakeholders—local developers, property owners, Utah Transit Authority (UTA), UDOT, Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC), etc. These meetings were to assess existing conditions and identify challenges, advantages, opportunities, and constraints. Also, to that end, a public meeting had been held last July to gather public input.

Phase II was initial master planning ideas—looking at very broad arrangements of what might make sense. From there they moved into Phase III which involved refining the plan. He explained this was where they found themselves that evening when he hoped further public feedback would be received. Phase IV involved creating an implementation plan. He pointed out that because the land was privately held, no one had control sufficient to make the plan come to fruition. This was a vision for what the area *could* be which would be used to guide redevelopment when property owners wished to make updates.

Mr. Weaver expanded upon the four objectives that Mr. McGrath had touched on during his introduction before introducing Ms. Talkington who presented information regarding the projected regional housing demand anticipated over the next several decades. She reiterated that Taylorsville was primarily built out but over time, could have opportunities to re-build on land that was currently being used in other ways.

Ms. Talkington pointed out that multi-family housing in various forms was becoming increasingly necessary and she anticipated that such products would continue to evolve. She indicated there had been a limited supply of such housing in Taylorsville and suggested that there was a huge opportunity to create more. She explained that while Taylorsville had maintained relative affordability compared to surrounding cities, it had struggled to attract the same level of new for-sale development.

Regarding retail development, there was a great deal of retail in the City. However, the concentration of regional centers limited the BRT retail opportunities to neighborhood-oriented, mixed-use scale until there were more households on site.

The impact of the pandemic, along with new office deliveries in West Valley City that had yet to fill up had resulted in a weakened office market with limited demand. Therefore, this plan did not include a great deal of new office space.


Ms. Talkington displayed a matrix depicting different types of land-use, the opportunities, and challenges for development with each, and the current market opportunities. She went on to address economic development strategies, both shorter and longer term:


Shorter Term Strategies


- Identify a demonstration project that leveraged uses that were feasible in the near term
- Attract development interest by removing entitlement, zoning, and regulatory obstacles
- Support early projects through the Redevelopment Agency that started to push density

Longer Term Strategies

- Lay the groundwork for larger scale, higher-intensity development
- Deploy specific financing tools to incentivize new development
- Implement zoning to make long term redevelopment sites HTRZ-ready (housing and transit redevelopment zones)

 Andy Hubbard of Great Basin Engineering explained that as the plan evolved, there would be certain triggers that would require infrastructure to be upgraded or added such as water, sewer, etc.

 Mr. Weaver explained that one station was the 1300 West station with a neighborhood to the north, which was unlikely to change much in character, and the Fore Lakes Golf Course to the south. The station in the center of the three would be Atherton Station. There was a mix of office and manufactured homes near there as well as an assortment of other types of buildings. The eastern-most station would be Riverboat Station which contained Monte Vista, Bridgeside Landing, Majestic Oaks, Sorenson Research Park, etc. Each area had essential green spaces--significant natural resources which they hoped to take advantage of and enhance. Mr. Weaver was excited for the opportunity to connect Jordan River Parkway to the entire surrounding neighborhood and discussed a proposed pedestrian and bike path with a large amount of landscaping.

 Bob Northfield then presented information regarding plans for retail development. He described the plan as “aspirational but achievable,” and explained it would take 5-25 years to become reality. It was a framework to guide future development in order to benefit the community and surrounding neighborhoods. He stated that the plan was informed by community interaction and was data driven. The hope was to amenitize the three station areas and add civic uses such as churches, schools, libraries, community centers, etc. Regarding diversity of residential products, the more density Taylorsville had, the more attainable housing would be for more people. Mr. Northfield mentioned that it was important to maintain and support employment centers such as Sorenson Labs, by adding things like food options and retail establishments that were within walking distance. He explained it was important to recognize areas of stability—those parts of the

master plan which were working well. The plan showed a combination of buildings, parks, and the connective tissues of a linear park that would run east and west and would help to unite the entire plan. The BRT stations would have rings of density nearby which would decrease as one moved farther away. He then went into more detailed explanations of what was proposed for each of the three station areas.

Commissioner Wright wished to emphasize the importance of tying into the Jordan River and making it a focal point. He expressed interest in reducing the speed on the Taylorsville Expressway. Mr. McGrath pointed out that as a state road, UDOT was responsible for setting the speed limit. Senior Planner Jim Spung pointed out however, that adding BRT and the associated rights-of-way was likely to slow traffic down. Beyond that, Economic/Community Development Director Wayne Harper indicated that the City would need to request a warrant study from UDOT which would look to see if the character of the roadway had changed, if there were aggravating circumstances that would justify a speed reduction, etc. He agreed with Mr. Spung's statement that speeds would naturally come down with the proposed area changes.

Commissioner Wright then asked Mr. McGrath about the timing of potentially adopting the plan. Mr. McGrath responded that there was some wiggle room, since statutorily the City was not required to have a plan in place until BRT was operational, and that was still two years away. The Planning Commission was not yet being asked to vote on adoption, as the plan was not yet ready for that. He estimated that their recommendation to the City Council would be sought sometime in July. It was then likely to be presented to the City Council in late summer or early fall of this year, after which formal certification would be sought from UTA and WFRC. Once certified, he mentioned that the intent was for the Station Area Master Plan be an addendum to the land use chapter of the General Plan which was currently undergoing an update.

Commissioner Wright wished to hear how the north/south connectivity would be addressed. He also wondered if there were any good case studies the consultants could share. Mr. Northfield responded that they had reviewed other projects for best practices and uses. For example, his firm had been involved in Farmington Station many years ago, so they had a familiarity with that. There were many other examples on both a local and national scale. They found that the most successful projects were those that were proactive about development and engagement with community by utilizing the best principles of complete streets, connectivity, a high degree of walkability, and great urban design guidelines. He explained those features built value at the ground level which then extended upward.

Commissioner Wright asked the consultants what they felt set the plan apart. Mr. Northfield responded that some of the exiting assets such as the Jordan River Park led to the idea of building upon the advantages already present. He felt the plan was a great way to balance attainable,

appropriate density with green and open space. Mr. Weaver added that all the existing mature trees was also a huge benefit.

Commissioner Wright inquired about any conversations that had taken place so far with private landowners in the area. Mr. Weaver responded that there was not a lot of interest in redeveloping their property, but that it was important for the City to be ready if/when that situation changed.

Ms. Talkington added that the fact that much of the privately held property in the area consisted of fairly large parcels meant that there might be several years with almost no redevelopment. However, she indicated it also meant there was more of an opportunity to institute some of the more major improvements in the future.

Commissioner Wright pointed out that there was a historic district south of the station (the Jordan River) which was notable and he hoped it could somehow be considered. He felt there was a great deal of value there.

Commissioner Young asked who would own/maintain the proposed new landscaping. Mr. McGrath responded that it would be integrated into the city-wide park system. Typically, adjacent property owners would be responsible for park strips although they would likely get better care by a professional arborist. Commissioner Young pointed out that 4700 South in that area was UDOT property which had not been well-maintained thus far.

Commissioner Young had additional questions regarding the proposed linear park as well as traffic control at the BRT stations. Mr. Weaver explained that the stations would include lights and dedicated pedestrian crossings. He stressed that safety was the primary concern.

Mr. Harper interjected that due to the width of 4700 South, there would likely be dual traffic controls where eastbound traffic stopped. It would all be included as part of the BRT design. Commissioner Young had further questions regarding traffic control at various intersections.

Commissioner Wendel pointed out that Taylorsville was in a position to do something and thrive or do nothing and blight. She was pleased single-family neighborhoods would be able to retain their character with this plan and asked Mr. Harper what state funding would be available to help make this vision a reality.

Mr. Harper responded that WFRC had funding, and the state had authorized some funding as well. Additionally, there were consulting groups with different resources.

Commissioner Wendel then expressed concern regarding residents in the nearby mobile home communities and wondered how to best keep them in Taylorsville. Mr. McGrath reiterated that they were all privately owned, and the City had little control of if or when they chose to sell, or to whom. Regarding relocation, that was unclear because at this point, no one knew if the property owners

would transition all the property or if they would do it in phases. He indicated the City's best tool for the concern she expressed was to utilize the SSD zoning classification which would require a development agreement to be in place. That would allow the City to work with the property owner and develop a relocation strategy for any displaced residents.

Ms. Talkington pointed out that was a challenge in every city with mobile home communities. Residents were at risk of displacement because they did not own the land. One of the best practices was the "build first" strategy which sought to ensure that there was new housing available before those residents were displaced. Admittedly it was not an easy thing to accomplish.

Mr. Spung pointed out that staff had been discussing incorporating some minimum level of affordable housing as part of new housing projects. According to Housing and Urban Development (HUD), a four-person household in Salt Lake County with a total income of \$100,000 was now considered "low income." It was important to figure out how to partner with developers and other financing resources to somehow subsidize rents or the cost of living. This could be done by leveraging higher densities to offset the cost of development, reducing parking requirements, etc. Staff had been keeping those things in the forefront of their minds.

Commissioner Quigley pointed out that it appeared less than 2% of those who received an invitation to this meeting and public hearing had responded, so he wished to thank those who took the time to attend. He wished to confirm that nothing in the plan involved the using the powers of eminent domain. Mr. Spung shook his head in the negative and reiterated that the goal was to have a vision ready for opportunities that presented themselves.

Commissioner Russell asked how the plan would fit with the areas just outside the station area. Mr. McGrath responded that a great deal of attention had been given to that. They wished to ensure that densities were stepped down as one grew closer to existing single-family neighborhoods and farther away from the BRT stations.

Chair Wilkey wondered how much of the total acreage was intended for different densities/heights. She also asked where people were meant to park. Mr. Northfield responded that there was a combination of surface lots, street parking, and parking structures. However, there was no dedicated parking at BRT stations currently in UDOT's plans. The plan was to get people to *walk* to the stations. He indicated it was possible that UDOT could be a catalyst for some of this development by offering to participate in some form of a parking agreement.

Mr. Harper pointed out that there had been discussions with UTA about bussing people to the stations.

Chair Wilkey opened the public hearing at 7:57 p.m.

Dennis Sanok indicated that the City had the power to do what made sense for Taylorsville—that the planning commissioners were the gatekeepers of what went to the City Council for approval. On response to an earlier comment, he wished to point out that Taylorsville was not *all* highly conservative. Instead, it was a melting pot. According to the census, only 50% considered themselves to be conservative. Regarding roads, he felt that in the future, 4700 South would need an additional lane going in each direction, and that should be part of the plan. He was surprised that he did not see more housing development planned for north of 4700 South. He also pointed out that current residents of mobile home communities would end up homeless if affordable housing was not provided. He hoped that Fore Lakes Golf Course would be retained as he considered it a “gem” of Taylorsville. Finally, if the plan need not be approved until 2026, he recommended waiting until then to do so. Perhaps the elected officials in office at that time would be more diverse than they currently were.

Olga (unknown last name) asked if there was any way to oppose the plan. She explained that she lived in a condominium near Fore Lakes and she hoped that the golf course would remain untouched. Chair Wilkey responded that her input was exactly what was sought that evening.

Paul Conlan stated that although change could be painful, he felt it was a good plan, but agreed there was no rush to adopt it. He did not feel Taylorsville was a safe place to bike or walk and suggested that 1300 West be closed to vehicular traffic.

Johnny Prettyman liked the plan and agreed that 1300 West should be closed to automobiles.

Clarence Fields expressed concern about the cost of water. The parks looked great but how could anyone afford to keep them watered? We are a desert.

David Vernon was excited to see the plan. He felt having amenities along 4700 South would be great. Where he worked in Sorenson Research Park was desolate, so it would be nice to have more businesses to engage the community.

There was no one else who expressed a desire to speak, so Chair Wilkey closed the public hearing at 8:12 p.m.

Commissioner Quigley agreed that 1300 West should be open only to pedestrians. Also, he hoped that somehow it could include a pocket park or wandering pathway so that it stayed a walkable community that could not be opened to vehicular traffic down the road. Mr. Weaver felt that would work well and knew that there would be further discussion about it.

In response to the comments regarding water, Commissioner Wendel pointed out this was a master plan so did not have the details that would address water availability and costs. She asked that resident to keep his eye out for public notices over the next several years when more specific site plans would be reviewed.

Commissioner Young mentioned the left-turn exit of Settler's Point and wondered if that would still be allowed after BRT was in place. Mr. Harper responded that the BRT vehicles would shift to the right so that they could turn onto Redwood Road and go up to Salt Lake Community College. He had not seen the final plans so he couldn't yet say how that particular exit would be affected.

Chair Wilkey thanked the consultants and staff, but especially the members of the public who attended and spoke. She asked for a motion to continue the discussion at a later date to be determined by staff.

MOTION: Commissioner Wendel moved that the Planning Commission continue the discussion regarding the Taylorsville Expressway Station Area Master Plan to a future date to be determined by staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed unanimously.


Mr. Harper commented that he wished to make it completely clear that it was **not** the City's intent to encourage anyone to change the use of their property right now. He hoped they would continue to be involved in the process and pointed out that there were related displays on the second floor for anyone to review. Staff members were happy to answer questions in person, by email or on the phone and sought input from as many people as possible so that it was "done right."

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wendel to attend the May 1, 2024 City Council meeting
--

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell, and Chair Wilkey declared the meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.


Jamie Brooks, City Recorder

