

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 9, 2024
Pre-meeting – 6:30 p.m. – Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

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

Community Development Staff

Jim Spung – Senior Planner
Terryne Bergeson - Planner
Jamie Brooks – City Recorder

Others Present: Eden Briggs, Sarah Kartchner, Bob Knudsen, Maya Marino, Monica Padilla and numerous unidentified individuals

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:30 P.M.

1. Briefing Session to Review the Agenda. (Jim Spung/AICP/Senior Planner)

Mr. Spung explained that the July 23rd Planning Commission meeting had been canceled due to the Pioneer Day holiday. The Commission would next meet on August 13.

Planner Terryne Bergeson then provided an overview of Agenda Item #4, explaining that the application was for a new reception center. The applicant was requesting extended business hours, and her property was within 250 feet of residential housing. Notice of a public hearing regarding this matter had been sent out on June 26th which resulted in only one phone call. That caller indicated she had no concerns if there were no police calls. The applicant originally asked to operate until 1:30 a.m. but later indicated she would accept whatever time would be deemed permissible by the City. She also indicated she would not allow alcohol to be served on site.

Commissioner Wendel wondered if 200 people in a 5000 square foot space was excessive. She asked Commissioner McElreath to weigh in as a former firefighting professional. He responded that it depended on the layout of the property. He also mentioned out that the fact that the building had a fire suppression system made that occupancy level less concerning. Ms. Bergeson stated that a building permit would be necessary due to the recent change of use, and occupancy limits would be addressed during that process.

Mr. Spung explained that staff was working on a text amendment to address reception centers. The intent was to standardize conditions of approval which would minimize the number of applications for that use which the Planning Commission had to address and discontinue handling each similar application on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner McElreath asked that a condition be added that the rear door remain closed during events to reduce noise to nearby residences, only to be used as an emergency exit. Ms. Bergeson responded that although she included mention of that in the staff report, she had inadvertently left it out of the conditions. However, it could be added by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Spung then briefed the Commissioners on Agenda Item #5 which was a text amendment in response to Senate Bill 13 previously passed by the Utah legislature. He explained that the City now must allow home-based schools to exist in *any* zone. A home-based “micro school” could allow up to sixteen K-12 students, while a commercial “micro-education” entity could allow up to 100 K-12 students.

The other part of the proposed amendment, Mr. Spung explained, consisted of amendments to vehicle and trailer standards associated with home occupations. This was an attempt to address an issue that code enforcement had brought to his department’s attention. The two issues, while not necessarily related, were in the same section of the city code.

Commissioner Quigley requested clarification regarding the planned location of parked vehicles and trailers. Mr. Spung responded that everything would need to be *behind* the residence (shielded from view at the front).

Commissioner Wright expressed concern regarding legislative over-reach with municipal governments. Mr. Spung agreed the state legislature was becoming more aggressive regarding land-use issues.

Commissioner Wendel pointed out that although she would not have voted in favor of the bill had she had the opportunity, this agenda item was now about complying with state law.

Commissioner Quigley asked that the two parts of Item #5 be separated so that the Commission could take a separate vote on each portion. Chair Wilkey agreed that would be best.

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 P.M.

Chair Wilkey then immediately opened the regular meeting at 6:31 p.m. and read the welcome statement.

CONSENT AGENDA

3. Review/Approval of the Minutes for the June 11, 2024 meeting

MOTION: Commissioner Russell moved to approve the minutes from the June 11, 2024 Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright.

Commissioner Russell: Aye
Chair Wilkey: Abstain
Commissioner Wright: Aye
Commissioner Quigley: Aye
Commissioner Wendel: Aye
Commissioner McElreath: Aye
Commissioner Willardson: Aye

Motion passes 6-0

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

4. Request for a Conditional Use Permit to Operate a Reception Center and Extended Hours of Operation at 4870 S. Redwood Rd; Applicant Monica Padilla (2Z24 – CUP-000465-2024 / Terryne Bergeson, Planner)

Ms. Bergeson explained that the applicant was requesting a non-administrative conditional use permit to operate a reception center in a tenant space within the True Value Plaza. The space was within 250 feet of homes and therefore required additional Planning Commission consideration to grant approval for a business to operate past 10 pm. The applicant had submitted a narrative with details of the proposed business operations (Exhibit H). The intent was to provide a space where customers could host family events.

Conditional use permits were governed by Utah State Code and were required to meet the provisions outlined in 10-9a-507. If the Planning Commission were to deny the CUP request it must be determined that *“reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use may be denied”*.

The land uses to the adjacent property were as follows: To the north was Mixed-Use (MU) Auto Repair; to the south was Boulevard-Commercial (BC) Self-Storage; the property to the east was zoned as Boulevard-Commercial (BC) Shopping Center, and the area directly west of the subject property was zoned as Residential (R-1-8) Single Family Neighborhood.

A public notice was mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property on June 28, 2024. As of July 3, 2024, staff had received only one inquiry. The caller lived directly behind the venue and stated that she did not have any concerns unless “there

are wild parties and a lot of police calls". If any additional comments were received, they would be noted in the public hearing presentation.

The parcel was zoned Mixed Use and had a General Plan designation of High-Density Mixed Use. The center itself was not consistent with the General Plan which defined a high-density mixed-use zone as consisting of at least 12 dual units in a mixed-use setting. However, the Land Development Code did identify the use as permitted with non-administrative approval and the request was consistent with the personal and retail services provided at the existing shopping center.

Section 13.33.050 of the LDC states the following related to the City's authority to impose conditions of approval on a conditional use permit application:

In order to achieve compliance with the standards set forth herein, the city may impose conditions that address:

A. Size, configuration, and location of the site and the proposed site plan layout.

B. Proposed site ingress and egress to existing and proposed roads and streets.

C. The adequacy, provision, relocation, or protection of public facilities and amenities, including roads and streets, culinary water, secondary water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, public safety and fire protections, and other utilities.

D. Design, location, and amount of off-street parking, loading areas and solid waste disposal, and refuse collection areas.

E. Site circulation patterns for vehicular, pedestrian and other traffic.

F. Massing, size, number, location, design, exterior features, materials, and colors of buildings, structures, and other facilities.

G. The location and design of all site features, including proposed signage, lighting, and site furnishings.

H. The provision of usable open space, public features, and recreational amenities.

I. Fencing, screening and landscape treatments, and other features designed to increase the attractiveness and safety of the site and protect adjoining property owners from noise, visual, and other impacts.

J. Measures directed at minimizing or eliminating possible nuisance factors including, but not limited to, noise, vibrations, smoke, dust, dirt, debris, plant materials, odors, gases, noxious matter, heat, glare, electromagnetic disturbances, and radiation.

K. Measures designed to protect the natural features of the site including wetlands and drainageways, groundwater protection, soils, wildlife, and plant life.

L. The regulation of operating hours for activities affecting normal schedules and functions.

M. Identifying a time for regular review and monitoring, as determined necessary, to ensure the use continues to operate in compliance with all conditions and requirements of approval.

N. Measures to ensure compliance with all conditions and requirements of approval, including, but not limited to, bonds, letters of credit, improvement agreements, agreements to conditions, road maintenance funds, and restrictive covenants.

176 *O. Other conditions determined reasonable and necessary by the city to allow the*
177 *operation of the proposed conditional use, at the proposed location in compliance with*
178 *the requirements of this code.*
179

180 **HOURS OF OPERATION:** In the submitted narrative (Ex H) the applicant listed proposed
181 hours to allow events to run until 1:00 am. The location was within 250 feet of a residential
182 zone, which required Planning Commission approval for hours of operation past 10 p.m.
183 (Section 13.23.200). The Planning Commission and staff reviewed several applications
184 for reception center use with similar location (shopping center abutting residential
185 neighborhood to the rear). Staff recommended that modified extended hours of operation
186 be granted in consideration of the residential neighbors to the west. The recommendation
187 was based on applications with similar site conditions, but in consideration of the distance
188 between the building and the homes to the rear, which were approximately 200 feet from
189 the reception center.
190

191 **NOISE:** All businesses were required to abide by Salt Lake County Health Department
192 noise regulations. The reception center was surrounded by properties that the county
193 ordinance designated as type A (single-family residential) and C (commercial retail type
194 uses). Quiet hours were between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. To ensure compliance with noise
195 regulations staff recommended any doors at the rear of the building remain closed during
196 events to prevent noise spill into the residential area, and that the applicant was
197 responsible to ensure that the operation did not exceed the decibel levels listed in the
198 county regulations. If complaints were reported, the applicant might be required to submit
199 verification of decibel levels and obtain building permits to make sound-proofing
200 improvements.
201

202 Chair Wilkey invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.
203

204 Monica Padilla introduced herself and made herself available for questions.
205

206 The Chair asked Ms. Padilla how she would go about ensuring that no alcohol was
207 brought on premises. She responded that her clients would have to sign a contract
208 agreeing to the conditions. She indicated that she would not be present at the evening
209 events and was considering hiring security.
210

211 Commission Quigley asked the applicant what type of events she anticipated having. She
212 expected weddings, birthdays, quinceañera's, and reunions.
213

214 Commissioner Wright asked if it would be problematic to keep the rear door to the facility
215 closed during events. She responded that it would not, but pointed out that the trash
216 receptacles were outside that door. Otherwise, it would be kept closed, and she indicated
217 that would be included in client contracts.
218

219 Commissioner Russell inquired about parking. Ms. Padilla responded that there was
220 plenty of parking, particularly in the evenings when most events took place. Ms. Bergeson
221 interjected that there were more than 100 parking stalls on site.

Commissioner Quigley asked her to clarify who the event hosts would be. She explained that it would be the customer who would have a key and would close up afterwards.

Chair Wilkey opened the public hearing. There was no one who expressed a desire to speak either in person or online, so the Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair Wright recommended adding the condition that the rear door be kept closed during events. Chair Wilkey agreed that was appropriate. The Chair also wished to clarify that although the applicant was interested in approval to stay open until 1:30 a.m., events were to end at midnight, with the host able to remain until 1:00 am (not 1:30) to clean up.

MOTION: Commissioner McElreath moved to approve File #17C24 / CUP-000465-2024, a request for a conditional use permit to operate a reception center with extended hours of operation at 4870 South Redwood Road, adding a 12th condition that the rear door was to remain closed, and all attendees were to remain inside the building during events. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wendel and passed unanimously.

ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT

5. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Zoning Text Amendment to Several Sections of the Taylorsville Municipal Code, to Align City Standards with Utah Senate Bill 13 Related to Home-Based Microschool and Micro-Education Entities as well as Amendments Related to Vehicles and Trailers Associated with a Home Occupation / 2Z24 / DCA-000435-2024 / Jim Spung, Senior Planner

Mr. Spung explained that the City of Taylorsville was requesting a text amendment to several sections of the Taylorsville Land Development Code (LDC) to align city standards with recent legislation passed by the Utah Legislature related to local government regulation of home-based microschools and micro education entities. The primary changes proposed by this amendment were:

- New land use types and definitions for “home-based microschool” and “micro-education entity.”
- Updated land use tables to allow home-based microschool, micro-education entity, and charter school as a permitted use in all zoning districts (except the open space zone).
- New special use standards for home-based microschool and micro-education entities.
- New and updated minimum vehicle parking standards for education uses.
- Updated definition for “charter school.”

Staff was also proposing modifications to the standards related to vehicles and trailers used in association with a home occupation. The primary changes proposed included:

- New modified standards to allow more vehicles and trailers for some large residential lots:

- o Within the R-1-20 or R-1-40 zoning district.
- o Primary access via collector or arterial street.
- o Vehicles and trailers parked behind primary residence and screened from public view.
- o Parking and maneuvering area limited to 35 percent of the rear yard area and located at least 50 feet from neighboring dwellings.
- o Maximum of 5 vehicles and 10 trailers at any given time.
- o Registered to the business owner or current resident.
- o Storage of equipment, materials, etc. not allowed.
- Gravel surface could be used when:
 - o Parking and maneuvering area had been designed and constructed to support weight of vehicles.
 - o Gravel was clean, compacted, free of weeds, dust, etc.
 - o Minimum 30-foot paved track-out pad was installed between the gravel surface and public street.
 - o Area was maintained to remain compliant with standards.

In the 2024 General Session, the Utah Legislature passed Senate Bill 13 (S.B. 13), resulting in revisions to how cities and counties regulated education entities. The intent of S.B. 13 was to provide home-based microschool and micro-education entities with certain similar duties, requirements, waivers, and rights as private and charter schools. A summary of S.B. 13 was provided below:

- Defined terms “home-based microschool” and “micro-education entity.”
- Required a county and municipality to consider a home-based microschool and micro education entity as a permitted use in all zoning districts;
- Identified the occupancy requirements to which a micro-education entity was subject;
- Required a local school board to excuse a student who attended a home-based microschool or micro-education entity under certain circumstances;
- Provided that an instructor of a school-age child who attended a home-based microschool or micro-education entity was solely responsible for instruction, materials, and evaluation;
- Prohibited a local school board from requiring a home-based microschool or micro-education entity to provide teaching credentials, submit to inspection, and conduct testing;
- Prevented government entities from regulating home-based microschool and micro-education entity food preparation and distribution under certain circumstances;
- Required a home-based microschool and micro-education entity to register as a business;
- Exempted a student who attended a home-based microschool or micro-education entity from immunization requirements; and
- Made technical and conforming changes.

Regarding the use of vehicles and trailers associated with home occupations, Mr. Spung explained that it had become more common in recent years. In an effort to support business-owners and entrepreneurs within the city, the city’s administration requested that staff research potential amendments to the zoning code to allow for added flexibility

regarding the parking of business vehicles and trailers while also ensuring proper safeguards were in place to minimize potentially negative impacts on surrounding uses.

S.B. 13 authorized local governments to adopt additional standards for these uses related to:

- Parking, traffic, hours of operation;
- city business license requirements;
- standards within each zone pertaining to setback, height, bulk and massing regulations, offsite parking, curb cut, traffic circulation, and construction staging; and
- imposing regulations on the location of a project that were necessary to avoid risks to health or safety.

In addition to the mandated requirements of S.B. 13, city staff was recommending additional standards be considered to ensure home-based microschools and micro-education entities operated safely and that potentially negative impacts of those uses were mitigated or minimized to the maximum extent practical. The following was a summary of additional standards for consideration:

Home-Based Microschool

- **13.11.040(G)(3) Minimum Parking.** The draft was proposing that a minimum of one vehicle parking space be provided for every non-resident employee, plus one additional space beyond that required for the primary dwelling.
- **13.11.040(G)(3) Secure Outdoor Play Area.** This standard required that a secure outdoor play area be provided in the rear or side yard, similar to the requirement for a home daycare and home preschool.

- **Location Standards.** A new table note was included with each land use table prohibiting a home-based microschool within 660 feet of a sexually oriented business or an establishment that sold alcohol.

Charter School

- **Location Standards.** A new table note was included with each land use table prohibiting a charter school within 660 feet of a sexually oriented business or an establishment that sold alcohol.

Micro-Education Entity

- **13.11.250(C) Secure Outdoor Play Area.** This standard required that a secure outdoor play area be provided that was located a minimum of five feet from a vehicle parking, access, or circulation area. The area must also be secured with a self-latching gate and be well-maintained.

- **13.11.250(D) ADA Loading Zone.** A minimum of one ADA compliant passenger loading zone be provided on-site.

- **Location Standards.** A new table note was included with each land use table prohibiting a micro-education entity within 660 feet of a sexually oriented business or an establishment that sold alcohol.

355 • **13.24.080(B) Minimum Parking.** Updated the minimum vehicle parking standards for
356 education entities.

357
358 As of July 5th, staff had not received any public comments in response to the published
359 notice of public hearing.

360
361 Staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the
362 City Council to amend the Taylorsville Municipal Code related to education entities and
363 standards related to vehicles and trailers associated with a home occupation, as specified
364 in Exhibit A of this Staff Report.

365
366 Chair Wilkey asked about requiring carbon monoxide detectors in the home-based
367 schools. Mr. Spung responded that although it was not required in this ordinance, he
368 believed it was addressed in the Building Code. He also mentioned that home occupation
369 applicants were given a self-inspection form to address the fire safety mechanisms in
370 place on site.

371
372 Commissioner Wright suggested requiring a CO2 detector as a condition of use as well
373 as smoke detectors.

374
375 Commissioner Young asked if there was a limit on how close two such schools could be
376 to one another (as was the case with home-based daycares). Mr. Spung responded in
377 the affirmative.

378
379 Commissioner Wright commented that the legislature's intent was likely to provide more
380 educational opportunities for youth. However, he wondered if there was room for the City
381 to require certain standards of these entities, similar to those required of public schools.

382
383 Commissioner Wendel responded that the way the 69-page bill was written, there was
384 "no accountability on these facilities."

385
386 Commissioner Wright felt it was unreasonable of the state legislature to force the City to
387 allow these entities and *not* allow any oversight by the City. He wished to push back
388 against the legislature on this issue and would support saying 'no' to the state telling
389 Taylorsville how to run schools within its borders.

390
391 **MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to separate Agenda Item #5 into two**
392 **separate issues: 1) microschools and micro education entities; 2) the**
393 **amendments related to vehicles and trailers Associated with a home**
394 **occupation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and**
395 **passed unanimously.**

396
397 Chair Wilkey opened the public hearing regarding the schools.

398
399 Maya Marino wondered if the amount of tax funds could be reduced to schools that failed
400 to follow certain standards.

Commissioner Wendel suggested Ms. Marino reach out to her local representatives and hoped she would stay involved in governmental issues.

Commissioner Quigley pointed out that “this isn’t our wheelhouse.” The suggestion needed to be addressed to the state legislature.

There was no one else who expressed a desire to address the Planning Commission, so Chair Wilkey closed the public hearing regarding the home-based microschools and micro-education entities.

Commissioner Wright felt it was important for the legislature to hear that there needed to be minimal standards for these organizations. He believed failing to forward a positive recommendation on this item would send a message to them.

Chair Wikley wondered, “if we don’t speak, who does?” and Commissioner Quigley wondered what unintended consequences would result from this bill. While he knew the Commission could make a statement, he did not believe it would change anything.

MOTION: Commissioner Wendel moved to forward a negative recommendation to the City Council regarding consideration of a zoning text amendment to several sections of the Taylorsville Municipal Code to align city standards to Utah Senate Bill 13 related to home-based micro schools and micro education entities. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright.

Commissioner Wright wished to add the following language: “... because there are no standards placed upon these other schooling entities.”

Commissioner Wendel: “And as discussed earlier, ‘over reach’ as well.”

Commissioner Young pointed out this was outside the scope of the Planning Commission’s purview.

Commissioner Wilkey responded that the City Council could make their own decision. However, we are just looking to send a negative recommendation. The legislature has their authority, and the Planning Commissioners were free to send either a positive or a negative recommendation.

Commissioner McElreath asked for clarification on the motion and expressed similar concerns to those of Commissioner Young.

Commissioner Wendel felt it would be helpful to have someone from the Legal Department present. She stated that the negative recommendation was that “we do not want to adopt this ordinance to comply with state law because of the impact it would have

on our city. We don't want to forward a positive recommendation just because we are told that we have to."

Commissioner Quigley felt that a negative recommendation defeated the reason why this item was being presented for review. This was already the law, regardless of whether the Planning Commission agreed with it.

Chair Wilkey pointed out that there was no time line on this item. She asked if perhaps the Commission should table it and ask Wayne Harper to attend the next meeting and weigh in on the matter.

Commissioner Quigley pointed out that Mr. Harper had made it clear on many occasions that in this building, he was not a State Senator. He was the Community and Economic Developer Director.

Commissioner McElreath called the question for the motion still on the table.

The motion on the table was withdrawn by Commissioner Wendel.

Chair Wilkey suggested the matter be tabled until a member of the legal team could be present.

Commissioner Wright felt an opportunity would be lost if that were to be done—the opportunity to send a message by saying no NOW.

To the Chair's comment regarding the legal team, Mr. Spung pointed out that they were present at all City Council meetings and had reviewed the matter. However, if the Commission wished to have a direct dialog with them in this forum, that could certainly take place.

MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council on 22Z24/DCA-000435-2024 regarding home-based microschools and micro-education entities, but to stress the Planning Commission's concern regarding the state legislature's continued overreach and ask that the City Council consider those concerns when the matter was before them.

The motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION: Commissioner Wendel moved to table File #22Z24/DCA-000435-2024 (regarding home-based microschools and micro-education entities) to the August 13, 2024 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell.

Commissioner McElreath: Nay
Commissioner Quigley: Nay

Chair Wilkey: Aye
Commissioner Wright: Aye
Commissioner Russell: Aye
Commissioner Willardson: Nay
Commissioner Wendel: Aye

The motion passed 4-3

PART TWO OF AGENDA ITEM NO. 5

5b. Public Hearing and Consideration of Amendments Related to Vehicles and Trailers Associated with a Home-Occupation / Jim Spung, Senior Planner

Mr. Spung explained that the second half of this Agenda Item was related to home occupation standards. He said residents with home businesses had shown quite a bit of interest in having the City address the number of vehicles and trailers allowed in rear yards (out of sight from the front of the home). Code Enforcement had reached out to discuss one specific home business which was non-compliant with city code as currently written.

The proposed amendment was intended to accommodate more intense home occupations in areas of the city where such uses might be deemed acceptable. Staff had performed GIS analysis to determine which existing properties in the city would qualify for the amended vehicle and trailer standards. These findings were summarized in Exhibit C of the staff report. In short, the primary changes proposed included the following:

- o Within the R-1-20 or R-1-40 zoning district.
- o Primary access via collector or arterial street.
- o Vehicles and trailers parked behind primary residence and screened from public view.
- o Parking and maneuvering area limited to 35 percent of the rear yard area and located at least 50 feet from neighboring dwellings.
- o Maximum of 5 vehicles and 10 trailers at any given time.
- o Registered to the business owner or current resident.
- o Storage of equipment, materials, etc. not allowed.

Gravel surface could be used when:

- o Parking and maneuvering area had been designed and constructed to support weight of vehicles.

o Gravel was clean, compacted, free of weeds, dust, etc.

o Minimum 30-foot paved track-out pad was installed between the gravel surface and public street.

o Area was maintained to remain compliant with standards

Mr. Spung explained that there were approximately 20 properties in Taylorsville that would qualify to have additional vehicles and trailers based on the listed criteria.

Commissioner Quigley expressed concern that the maximum of five vehicles plus ten trailers was too high. Mr. Spung pointed out that because residents would be limited vehicles taking up no more than 35% of the rear yard area, the resulting number of vehicles might or might not equal that many.

Commissioner Quigley spoke against the proposed amendment, expressing concern for homeowners situated *behind* such lots. He suggested it made more sense for the homeowner prompting this amendment to bring his property into compliance rather than change the entire city's code to accommodate his individual situation.

Commissioner Wendel wondered how this would impact an R-1-10, R-1-20 or flag lot property owner who wished to subdivide behind one of these situations. Mr. Spung responded they would not be able to do so. Commissioner Wendel suggested it would then be potentially decreasing the value of such neighboring lots. Commissioner Quigley agreed.

Commissioner Wright felt that requiring increased vegetation at the 6' fence might be a more appropriate screen/buffer than the fence alone. Commissioner Young asked if such a business owner would be required (for example) to plant trees that were 30' today or that would eventually grow to be 30'.

Mr. Spung clarified that the proposed code did not require the vehicles to be screened so as not to be visible from neighboring homes. Instead, they could not be visible from the public right-of-way. That is, from the front of the home.

Commissioner McElreath felt that the minimum 50' distance from neighboring dwellings should be increased. He also wondered about possibly adding some restrictions pertaining to noise from these vehicles.

Commissioner Wendel was not comfortable restricting a homeowner's opportunity for future residential development in favor of a commercial use in a residential neighborhood.

Chair Wilkey opened the public hearing.

Sarah Kartchner spoke against the amendment, expressing privacy concerns for adjacent neighbors.

Eden Briggs spoke in favor of the amendment, assuming the specified parameters were met.

There was no one else in person or on-line who expressed a desire to speak, so Chair Wilkey closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Wright stated he was “not thrilled” with this concept and was particularly bothered with the idea of a commercial use taking precedence over a residential use in an area zoned for residential.

MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to forward a negative recommendation to City Council regarding File #2Z24/DCA-000435-2024B to amend the Taylorsville Municipal Code related to Vehicles and Trailers Associated with a Home Occupation. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright.

Chair Wilkey:	Aye
Commissioner Russell:	Aye
Commissioner Willardson:	Nay
Commissioner Wendel:	Aye
Commissioner Wright:	Aye
Commissioner McElreath:	Nay
Commissioner Quigley:	Aye

Motion passed 5-2

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION

Commissioner Willardson provided a brief summary of the City Council meeting of June 19, 2024.

Commissioner Russell would attend the July 17th Council meeting and Commissioner Wright would attend the August 7th meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Jamie Brooks
City Recorder