

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
November 12, 2024
Briefing – 6:00 p.m. / Regular Session – 6:30 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance-

Planning Commission

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

Community Development Staff

Jim Spung – Senior Planner
Terryne Bergeson – Planner
Jamie Brooks – City Recorder
Mark McGrath – Long Range Planner

Excused: Commissioner Marc McElreath

Others Present: Carol Barke, Lenny Barke, George Bell, Michelle Bell, Debbie Bona, Joey Bona, Natalie Bona, Tiffany Bona, Bernadette Brockman, Michelle Butterfield, Wes Butterfield, Carlene Cosgrove, Tom Cosgrove, Debbie Ekker, Matt Ekker, Kelly Guymon, Paxton Guymon, Bruce Holman, Susan Holman, Jarl Jacobson, Ruth Jacobson, Robert Knudsen, Bloman Krantz, Ed Lloyd, Teri Lloyd, Kelvin Meier, Sarah Meier, Gary Olson, Sheri Olson, Brady Patterson, Maggie Paul, Jerry Paul, David Shaw, Jodi Sieg, and Monte Watkins

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

Chair Wilkey called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Commissioner McElreath was excused, and Commissioner Wendel was present via a Zoom link.

Commissioner Wright mentioned that he would not be present at the special meeting scheduled for December 3rd.

Senior Planner Jim Spung explained that Agenda Items #3, #4 and #6 were all related to a single project for which he would make a single presentation. He pointed out that staff was not recommending that the Commission make a formal recommendation that evening but instead to hear from the public and take their input into account before making a recommendation at a future meeting.

Mr. Spung indicated that the project involved a 5+-acre parcel of land which was bounded by both Kearns and West Jordan. The applicant was asking for an SSD designation (Site-Specific Development Residential) to accommodate some planned townhomes. The development included some single-family homes as well. Everything internal to the project would be privately owned and maintained. The proposed lot size of each was between 4100 and about 5700 square feet. Staff had made recommendations regarding

the site plan and the applicant had verbally agreed to each of them. Mr. Spung said he would provide greater detail during the regular meeting.

Regarding Agenda Item #5, pre-existing reception centers would be grandfathered in. If the proposed code were to be approved, it would only apply to applications for new reception centers in the city.

Mr. Spung explained that Mark McGrath and Terryne Bergeson would take the lead on the general plan updates.

Commissioner Willardson updated his fellow planning commissioners on the City Council meeting of November 6th.

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 P.M.

Chair Wilkey opened the regular meeting at 6:30 p.m. and read the welcome statement. She then explained that agenda items #3, #4 and #6 would be heard as one.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Review/Approval of the Minutes for the October 22, 2024 Planning Commission meetings.

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to approve the minutes of the October 22, 2024 Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Willardson and passed unanimously.

GENERAL PLAN MAP & ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS
(Legislative Actions)

3. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a General Plan Map Amendment for Approximately 5.3 Acres of Property at 4027 West and 4035 West 6200 South From Low-Density Residential to High-Density Residential; (File 2G24 – GPLAN-000486-2024 / Jim Spung, Senior Planner)

4. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Text Amendment to Chapter 13.44 of the Taylorsville Municipal Code, Adopting Standards for the SSD-R Taylor Villas Zoning District. (File #6Z24-DCA-000485-2024 /Jim Spung, Senior Planner)

6. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Map Amendment for Approximately 5.3 Acres of Property at 4027 West and 4035 West 6200 South from Single-Family Residential (R-1-40) to Site Specific Development Residential (SSD-R) / File #7Z24-DCA-000-484-2024; Jim Spung, Senior Planner

 Chair Wilkey explained to those present that these items were legislative in nature as opposed to administrative.

Mr. Spung pointed out that this project was relatively complex, and he did not recommend the Planning Commission vote on it that evening but instead, take some time to allow for improvements. He provided a brief overview of how the project was expected to move through the approval process. He explained that the General Plan Map Amendment was the long-term land use vision and/or policy. The Zoning Text Amendment would address the zoning rules that would be in place and finally, the Zoning Map Amendment would apply those rules to the subject parcel. Everything reviewed that evening would be conceptual in nature. Site plan and subdivision review would take place later in the process.

He explained that the subject property was 5.3 acres of land, adjacent to portions of both Kearns and West Jordan. It was primarily surrounded by single-family homes.

Commissioner Wright asked if Kearns and West Jordan residents had been invited to the public hearing or if the notice only went to Taylorsville residents. Mr. Spung responded that notices were sent to all property owners within 300' of the project, regardless of the city of residence.

The applicant had agreed to some improvements to the public right-of-way along both Fairwind Drive and 6200 South. In short, he would replace the current park strip with a new 5' landscaped park strip with street trees. He had also agreed to replace the existing 4' sidewalk with a new 6' sidewalk.

 Mr. Spung explained that the General Plan guided land use and development decisions that addressed the present and future needs of the City. The goal was to create coordinated, efficient, and harmonious growth and development. The Planning Commission reviewed and made recommendations to the City Council regarding

amendments to the General Plan. The City Council, at their discretion, could revise the General Plan when it believed it to be appropriate and in the best interest of the City and its residents.

Mr. Spung displayed the concept development plan for the subject property, describing the proposed lot size, explaining that currently the proposal was for eleven single-family homes and 42 townhomes of two varieties. The result would be roughly 10 units per acre which placed it in the high-density category of housing.

Commissioner Wright asked where the closest high-density project was to the subject property. Mr. Spung suspected it might be Summit Vista, but he would check and get back to him.

Any amendments to the proposed land use map were to consider (and not be in conflict with) the following principles:

- Promote economic sustainability
- Promote efficient use of land and public infrastructure
- Provide community amenities and benefits
- Protect environmentally sensitive lands
- Support alternate modes of transportation including pedestrian
- Create safe attractive neighborhoods and protect residential quality of life
- Minimize non-compatible adjacent land uses

Any amended or revised general plan could provide for:

- Health, general welfare, safety, energy conservation, transportation, prosperity, civic activities, aesthetics and recreational, educational, and cultural opportunities
- The reduction of waste of physical, financial, or human resources that resulted from either excessive congestions or excessive scattering of population
- The efficient and economical use, conservation, and production of the supply of:
 - Food and water; and
 - Drainage, sanitation, and other facilities and resources
- The use of energy conservation and solar and renewable resources
- The protection of urban development
- The protection and promotion of housing, including moderate income housing
- The protection and promotion of air quality
- The protection of open space and natural areas
- Historic preservation
- Identification of uses of land that are likely to require an expansion or significant modification of services or facilities provided by affected entities
- The protection and promotion of economic growth and development
- An official street map
- An official parks, recreation, and trails map

 Regarding the zoning text and map amendments, current zoning of the subject property was R-1-40 but this application proposed a Site-Specific Development (an SSD zone.) That designation was created to allow the most efficient and creative development

of lands that had unique or unusual characteristics. SSD was to be used when the uses on a specific parcel were appropriate for the location but might not be appropriate for a community wide land use ordinance.

According to the Land Development Code, an SSD shall:

1. Develop uses and development standards as described in subsection F of the LDC
2. Clearly articulate rules for how an area would develop
3. Build in flexibility beyond that allowed by the typical land use ordinances
4. Contain more precise linkages between density, land use and public facility requirements
5. Contain provisions that would respond to changing conditions without the need for a zone change or amendment
6. Contain regulations which applied to a particular area without changing city-wide ordinances
7. Be used as the basis for a development agreement; and
8. Contain comprehensive and cohesive integration of all aspects of development and guidance that needed to be administered for the development of the site

Mr. Spung indicated that staff had determined this proposed project satisfied the above criteria. Some unique features of the project were the single-family lots ranging in size from 4,100 to 5,700 square feet; the alley-loaded townhomes; and the modified street cross-sections.

Staff recommended the following updates to the plan:

- Align Cheltonham Way with new street
- 5' park strip and 5' sidewalk along the single-family lots
- 6' wide sidewalks throughout the project
- Sidewalk connection to 3975 West

A traffic impact study had been conducted and it was anticipated that the project would generate 404 daily trips on weekdays (28 trips during morning peak times and 36 during evening peak times.) The engineers felt the project as currently proposed would have minimal effect on the existing traffic flow.

Regarding vehicle parking in the project, there would be four spaces per unit (two in the garage and two in the driveway) plus 29 guest spaces, resulting in a proposed ration of 4.5 spaces per unit which met the minimum requirement of 4 spaces per unit.

There would be a 20' setback along 6200 South and Fairwind Drive, 15' rear yard setbacks along existing single-family homes, a 30' common green between townhouse units, and a 12' setback between townhouse buildings.

 As for landscaping, there was currently a proposed 8,500 square feet of common open space which was approximately 4.6% of the net development area. The space would include a pavilion, picnic tables and a small playground. Staff had recommended

that area be increased to 10% of the net development area. The proposed plants would be drought tolerant, satisfying the city's xeriscape and water-wise ordinances.

Mr. Spung then displayed the architectural elevations for both the single-family homes as well as the townhomes. The development agreement would prohibit home elevations from being duplicated, so each home would be different in its appearance.

Commissioner Quigley asked how many bedrooms each unit would have. Mr. Spung responded that floor plans had not yet been submitted.

Staff had recommended that front facades include a higher percentage of brick and/or stone than was currently proposed.

Other notable features of the project:

- Eligible for the 1st time homebuyers' program which limited the sale price of the townhomes to \$450,000 with \$20,000 down payment assistance
- Qualifying units were required to be owner-occupied initially
- Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CCRs) were to include a limit on the number of rentals at any given time
- Grading and drainage
 - Reviewed during subdivision application
 - Required to detain 100-year storm event (0.2 cfs release) and retain on-site for 80th percentile storm
 - Must identify stormwater overflow path that would not negatively impact neighbors.

Some Discussion Items were:

- Staff provided review comments from November 7, 2024 and the applicant had verbally agreed to conform with all of them
- Rental limitations and homeownership requirements
- Open Space – staff recommended minimum 10% usable amenity
- Street cross sections and streetscape design (park strip & sidewalk)
- Architectural design; staff recommended side elevations be enhanced
- Fencing and buffering along east and south boundaries
- Elements to update prior to formal action
- Date for Planning Commission to take formal action

Chair Wilkey invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Paxton Guymon explained that working with staff, there had been several iterations of his concept, and they had also held a neighborhood meeting in July. One of his goals was to take advantage of the first-time home buyer program which only applied to new construction—not to existing housing stock. One challenge was that there were no single-family homes currently being built with a \$450,000 price tag or less. Because of that, the program could only apply to townhomes and condominiums. Nearby neighbors had made it clear that they wanted less density which was why single-family homes had been added

to the project. Nearby residents were also very concerned that there be adequate parking on site. Because of that concern, Mr. Guymon had planned to have 4.5 parking spaces per unit, with extra-long (22' foot) driveways. He pointed out that the market was missing this type of unit.

He also explained that the reason the concept currently before the planning commission did not include the input he had previously been provided was that he hoped to update the plans en masse once more feedback was received by the commission and by those that spoke at the public hearing that evening. He pointed out that there was always opposition to change, and he asked that the commissioners keep that in mind as they listened to the public comments that evening.

Commissioner Quigley agreed with Mr. Guymon's comments regarding the current housing situation. He asked how many bedrooms the homes would have. Mr. Guymon responded that they would have 3- and 4-bedrooms each. He pointed out that they would have more square footage than many of the existing homes in nearby neighborhoods.

Commissioner Russell asked if Edge Homes had any similar projects in the valley that they could look at. Mr. Guymon stated he would send a list of addresses for Mr. Spung to forward to him.

Commissioner Quigley stated that he had sold some Edge Homes and felt they were all quality products.

Commissioner Willardson expressed concern about ensuring that many of these units would be owner-occupied. Mr. Guymon responded that every initial sale in the project would need to be owner-occupied. Commissioner Willardson also asked how he would ensure that only one family lived in each. Mr. Spung responded that was already addressed in the city code and that it was not a problem unique to this project or even to Taylorsville.

Commissioner Young asked how many of the proposed units would fall within the \$450,000 target price point. Mr. Guymon responded that each of the internal units would be, although it was somewhat market driven. They were not deed-restricted with pricing.

Mr. Spung clarified that the homebuyer's incentive and \$450,000 price tag was only available for the initial sale of the home. Future sales of each unit would be based on the market rate.

Chair Wilkey asked what the target price was on the eleven single-family homes. Mr. Guymon pointed out that it depended on the finishes that each initial owner chose, but he surmised it would be between \$575,000 and \$650,000.

The Chair expressed concern that the lots were not sufficiently large to accommodate families. Mr. Guymon felt they were large enough to accommodate parking and living but understood the desire to increase the percentage of green space in the project so that

there would be room to enjoy the outdoor space. It would involve losing one of the single-family homes, however.

Mr. Guymon continued by pointing out that the SSD ordinance was critical to his application because it provided flexibility for in-fill with parcels such as these. There would be no burden on the city because the HOA would plow the private roads and maintain the landscaping.

Commissioner Wendel asked for clarification regarding the width of the proposed sidewalks. Mr. Guymon responded that a 5' park strip would be professionally landscaped and then there would be a 6' sidewalk along the perimeter of the project. Internal sidewalks would be 5' wide.

Commissioner Wright asked Mr. Guymon if he intended to redevelop the sidewalk at the 3975 West area. He responded that he would if it were to be required. He pointed out that it had not yet been specifically addressed with staff, but the goal was to have a new perimeter around the entire project.

Chair Wilkey opened the public hearing at 7:35 p.m.

Monte Watkins explained that he lived in Taylorsville just south of the subject property. He wondered about access to the project, specifically because of a school bus stop at the southwest corner. He had heard that the city did not want it accessed from 6200 South, and he wondered why that was, considering the fact that West Jordan allowed it just west of this location. He also expressed concern about having sidewalk access at the northeast corner because he felt it would be hazardous. Finally, he was not convinced there would be sufficient parking at the project.

Michelle Bell stated that her property backed on to the subject property and bordered proposed lots 9, 10, and 11. She was concerned about a loss of privacy to her backyard if two-story homes were built as was planned. She also felt that rodent control would be necessary when construction began.

Joey Bona indicated he had two concerns. First, despite what the traffic study suggested, anyone living in the neighborhood was well aware that afternoon rush-hour traffic was already quite challenging, so this project would definitely have an adverse effect. Second, according to the police department, there had been thirty traffic accidents in the last 2.5 years between Fairwind Drive and Misty Drive already in the last year.

Tom Cosgrove asked that a traffic light be installed at the northwest corner of 6200 South and Fairwind Drive if the project was approved.

Wes Butterfield wished to respond to Commissioner Wright's earlier question regarding other nearby multi-family projects. He pointed out that Hidden Oaks Apartments were nearby with 96 units; Montebello Townhouses were just west of there and had 86 units, Sanctuary Place had 20 units on 4700 South Simper Lane and of course the Volta

development (less than one mile away) proposed 647 units. He was concerned about parking and traffic concerns affecting the safety of children in the area.

Dennis Curtis was grateful that it appeared there would no longer be a drainage pond on site. He wondered how a required pump out station would impact residents in the area. He asked if each unit would have its own solid waste cans or if there would be a communal dumpster. If a dumpster, where on site would it be located? Finally, he wished to know if the \$450,000 price point was guaranteed.

David Shaw felt that each unit was unlikely to have 4.5 parking spaces since garages tended to be used for storage. Therefore, he felt that overflow parking in nearby neighborhoods might become an issue after all. He expressed concern with how narrow Fairwind Drive was, anticipated pedestrian and vehicular traffic problems as well as ingress/egress questions.

Jody Sieg pointed out the uniqueness of the neighborhood in that the only main road nearby was 6200 South which resulted in a large amount of traffic.

Sarah Meier pointed out that certain nearby homes were originally unincorporated but were annexed into West Jordan to accommodate the developer at the time. She stated that they had wanted to be in Taylorsville.

Gary Olson said he lived on Misty Drive, and the area already had too much traffic. He was concerned about that problem increasing with this project. He also wished to point out that although they were being told that the CCRs would require initial owners to live on-site and not make their units available to rent, CCRs could be changed with enough votes.

Bernadette Brockman asserted that it was unlikely that those in need of the first-time homeowner incentive would be able to afford these homes. She also wondered if nearby properties would lose value because of these units or if taxes would be increased because of them.

Brady Patterson was concerned about multiple families living in single-family units. Regarding parking in and around the subject property, he asked that Fairwind Drive curb be painted red so that it could be reserved for emergency vehicles only. Also, he requested speed bumps on Misty Drive even though he had heard that Taylorsville did not like them.

Ed Lloyd also expressed concerns with the influx of people to the neighborhood due to this project. Like Mr. Patterson, he wanted speed bumps on Misty Drive.

Natalie Bona stated that although the number of proposed units in the project had been reduced from what was originally proposed, she felt there were still too many units.

There was no one else who expressed a desire to speak, so Chair Wilkey closed the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

Mr. Spung mentioned that he had received written comments from Mr. Shaw as well as George and Michelle Bell, who had spoken during the public hearing. He read an email from Angela Jeo who had not. Ms. Jeo had expressed concern for multi-family housing in that neighborhood, increasing traffic and noise, and an anticipated strain on public services. However, she suggested single-family homes on the site would be a welcome addition to the area.

Commissioner Wright wished to thank Mr. Spung and the rest of the planning staff for working with the community and developer on this project. He referenced the housing shortage and pointed out that some areas were appropriate for multi-family developments, but he was not convinced this area was one of those. He felt it made more sense to match the nearby housing stock which was single-family homes. In short, he indicated that he did not support this application.

Commissioner Willardson would not want to have these homes looking into his yard if he lived nearby. He felt there were better uses of the land than what was being proposed.

Commissioner Quigley wondered if the units could be reduced to one story rather than two, thereby alleviating the concerns about losing privacy in the backyards of existing homes. He commented that there was a term for the reaction that many were having to this housing concept, and it was NIMBYism – “Not In My Backyard.” People are aware of the housing crisis and the need for solutions, but did not want the solutions to take place in their own neighborhoods. He pointed out that the developer had been willing to accommodate the requests that had been made thus far, and he maintained an open mind regarding the project.

Commissioner Wright made the following comments: he felt the 20' setback should be increased; he would consider different ideas for walks and park strips, indicated that a 5' park strip was not much, and that 6' or wider would be better for proper tree growth. He also stated that he had read the traffic study, and it seemed some information was missing from it. He was grateful for the community's input on the proposal.

Chair Wilkey invited the applicant to return to the podium.

Mr. Guymon requested clarification regarding townhomes. Was the Commission saying no townhomes would be acceptable? Or were they open to having some with increased setbacks and wider sidewalks, etc.? He sought further guidance so he would know what changes he needed to make.

Commissioner Wright responded that perhaps if he cut the number of units in half, he might be ok with the proposal, as long as a density of R-1-7 or R-1-5 was maintained.

Commissioner Quigley pointed out that one of Mr. Paxton's goals was to be able to take advantage of the home-buyer's assistance program; and that was only available for homes priced at \$450,000 or less. Only townhomes could be built for that—single-family residences would be above that today. Therefore, the opportunity disappeared if the number of units was cut in half. As a realtor, he was frustrated with the market and the current level of housing stock. He did not know how his grandchildren would be able to live in the Salt Lake Valley and explained that many people had to commute for an hour or an hour and a half because they could not afford to live in the Salt Lake Valley. Small plots of land like this one were all that was left in Taylorsville. No one was trying to ruin anyone's life but increasing traffic and an increased number of people could not be avoided. If we did not choose something reasonable for the site, someone else would come along and propose something even more dense.

Mr. Spung appreciated the public who attended the meeting. One of the jobs that staff was faced with was to relay information that would help the Planning Commission and the City Council make decisions. He stated there were a few things happening in the background that were worth mentioning. There was legislation anticipated for January which would require all cities to allow a 5,000 square foot lot in any residential zone. There were discussions about eliminating any parking requirements, meaning that projects such as this could be built with no parking provided as opposed to the current proposal to provide 4.5 spaces per home. There was also a proposal to not require garages in any residential zones statewide. In short, there were many things happening at the state level that were designed to remove barriers to residential development. An SSD zone would mean that the city would have a great deal of discretion regarding what it required and what could be done with the design and the quality of development. The state had already passed legislation prohibiting cities from regulating any architectural elements of single-family homes unless it was part of a planned negotiated district such as an SSD.

Chair Wilkey expressed concern about the small size of the proposed lots, despite the fact that the homes themselves were fairly large. The homes were large enough to accommodate a family, but there was very little outdoor space for them to use.

Commissioner Wright pointed out that his son lived on a similarly small lot in Eagle Mountain, but the size was offset by the fact that there was open space and recreational trails nearby which would not be present in this proposed development.

Mr. Spung stated that was one of the primary reasons staff had recommended that at least 10% of the land area be devoted to open space. The biggest issue was that people needed somewhere to live, and this project would provide that. Comments had been made earlier about more than one family living in a home intended for a single family. This proposal sought to alleviate that problem by providing more housing. He asked for some specific ideas of what they would be in favor of so that Mr. Guymon knew what to bring back. Regarding setbacks on 6200 South, that was measured from the property line, so there would be an additional 11 feet-- a 5' park strip, 6' sidewalk, and an additional 20' for a total of about 31' buffered from 6200 South in addition to landscaping. As for the lot size, most of the pre-WWII lots were 3000 sq feet and there were several communities

in the country that were now allowing 2500 sq foot lots. The proposed 4100 sq feet was not much of a stretch.

Commissioner Young appreciated Mr. Guymon striving to build a product at a \$450,000 price point. The Wasatch Front was short between 20-35 thousand homes based on current needs.

MOTION: Commissioner Russell moved to continue Files #2G24, #6Z24, and #7Z24 to the December 10 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Willardson.

Commissioner Wendel: Aye
Commissioner Quigley: Aye
Chair Wilkey: Aye
Commissioner Wright: Aye
Commissioner Russell: Aye
Commissioner Willardson: Aye
Commissioner Young: Aye

Motion passed 7-0

The meeting recessed briefly at 8:33 p.m. and continued at 8:43 p.m.

5. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Text Amendment to Sections 13.08.020, 13.11.250, and 13.36.190 of the Taylorsville Municipal Code, Updating Standards Related to Reception Centers; / File 8Z24-DCA-000496-2024; Jim Spung, Senior Planner

 Mr. Spung explained that this was a city-initiated application for a text amendment based on issues that had arisen previously with reception centers in Taylorsville. The intent was to streamline and clarify the requirements and to promote the public health, safety, and welfare. A definition had been amended to make it clear that these facilities were for contracted, private, invitation-only events. Regulatory items such as the noise ordinance and how to handle repeated events had been moved to the *Standards* section of the code rather than having them contained within the definition. It had also been clarified that these events were different from a religious assembly which was protected under a different federal code.

One of the proposals was to change reception centers from a non-administrative conditional use which was reviewed by the planning commission to a review at the staff level. The biggest reason for this was that staff felt the standards as now proposed addressed everything that the planning commission would review and discuss. The procedure still allowed the Director to elevate an application to review by the planning commission if there was something unique that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Spung explained that the other large change in this amendment was to not allow reception centers in the neighborhood-commercial zone, limited-commercial zone, mixed-use zone, or transit-corridor zone. They would be allowed in Boulevard-Commercial (BC), Community Commercial (CC), and Professional Office (PO).

The amendment proposed to limit the number of such facilities in the city to no more than one per 10,000 population. Additionally, no such facility could be permitted within 1,000 feet of another. Mr. Spung clarified that current reception centers would be grandfathered in.

As for hours of operation, events within 250 feet of a residential district were to terminate at 10:00 p.m. unless otherwise approved by the planning commission. And under no circumstances could an event continue past midnight. For events without alcohol, at least one employee had to be on site for the duration of the event if it continued past 10:00 p.m. if there were 75 or more people present.

Commissioner Quigley expressed concern about enforcing such requirements. Mr. Spung responded that per 13.11.250(C), the facility owner would be required to sign a notarized affidavit acknowledging the many requirements. That way, the property owner would be put on notice that they were solely responsible for any violations. Such would be the case even if the property owner leased the facility to a tenant.

Commissioner Wright indicated a desire to require that an employee be on site during any event regardless of what time it was or how many people were present. Commissioner Willardson spoke in favor of that as well. Commissioner Wright said he would then feel it unnecessary to require security to be present. Mr. Spung responded that security would be addressed when he described the requirements for events with alcohol. So far, he had only addressed events without it.

He continued by indicating that the contact info of the responsible party would also need to be kept displayed on the exterior of the business. Moreover, that person would need to be available by phone at all times and able to physically respond within one hour. Mr. Spung pointed out that if the Planning Commission chose to adopt Commissioner Wright's suggestion, that last requirement would not be necessary since a responsible party would already be on site.

Once a business license was issued to a new reception center, information regarding the conditions of approval would be mailed to all property owners and residents within 300' for the building so nearby residents would know exactly what was required of the establishment.

Mr. Spung went on to review the recommended requirements for when alcohol was to be served. One such requirement was that for events that continued past 10:00 p.m., a minimum of one employee and one licensed/insured security guard per 75 attendees would be required onsite for the duration of the event.

Commissioner Young expressed concern about that requirement since such guards had no legal authority to do anything in the event of a problem. Mr. Spung felt it still helped to have such a presence. It would be an incentive to avoid problems when alcohol was present. But he was open to suggestions. Commissioner Young felt that having a responsible party present negated the need for a security guard.

Commissioner Quigley disagreed, feeling that the presence of a security guard would be helpful. They might have more training to handle problem situations than perhaps the average person would if alcohol consumption led to an issue. Therefore, he was in support of what staff proposed.

Mr. Spung finished outlining the language that staff proposed for the remainder of the zoning text amendment.

Commissioner Wright wished for the planning commission to be required to review an application for a large, professional reception center as opposed to the small, "mom and pop" facilities currently in the city.

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

Commissioner Wright stated he was fine with the current wording in the proposal regarding ownership. His only requested change was that the planning commission review an application for a particularly large facility. There was some discussion regarding what size an appropriate threshold might be. Staff would choose a threshold and forward it to the City Council with the rest of the proposal.

MOTION: **Commissioner Quigley moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #8Z24-DCA-000496-2024 to amend the Taylorsville Municipal Code related to reception centers, as specified in Exhibit A of the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Willardson and passed unanimously.**

OTHER MATTERS

7. Discussion Regarding the Taylorsville General Plan Update Project – Chapter 2: *Community Character*; Chapter 3: *Land Use*; and Chapter 9: *Environmental*; Mark McGrath, Long-Range Planner

 Long-range Planner Mark McGrath explained that he would review chapters 3 and 2, after which Ms. Bergeson would introduce Chapter 9.

He explained that at the Special Workshop on December 3rd, he would review Chapters 5 (Economic Development), 6 (Parks and Recreation), and 7 (Neighborhoods). The following week they would discuss the finalized document as a whole. A public hearing

would take place in January and the Planning Commission would be asked to make a formal recommendation to the City Council at the end of the month if they were ready.

Regarding the Station Area Master Plan, the public hearing was scheduled for February 10, and hopefully they would be ready to provide a formal recommendation two weeks later.

Chapter 3: Land Use

First, the proposed Land Use Map had still not been finalized. He displayed what he had so far, however. The five guiding principles of the updated General Plan were:

1. Balance, Diversity and Social Equity
2. Stewardship
3. Resilience
4. Civic Beauty and Character
5. Health and Mental Wellbeing

Mr. McGrath explained that the General Land Use Map had changed very little in the last thirty or so years, although the world certainly had. Fifty-eight percent of the private property within the city was zoned for single-family housing. He displayed the 17 different place types as outlined in the proposal as well as several that were being eliminated.

Several of the proposed changes to the Map were briefly reviewed. The final version would include a table of all the changes. It was projected that Salt Lake County would gain an additional 483,000 residents in the next 35 years, so it was important that housing be made available for those people. He explained the 5% Strategy which was a plan to focus the needed growth in 5% of Taylorsville's footprint. The five principles for achieving the strategy were:

- Focus growth in centers along major transportation corridors and near transit stations;
- Create areas of high-density mixed use in targeted areas throughout the city;
- Encourage infill and redevelopment;
- Limit change in existing neighborhoods;
- Preserve open space and sensitive lands.

Below is a table showing where additional residential units could be placed in order to accomplish the 5% Strategy.

Volta	647 Entitled Units
Summit Vista	1040 Entitled Units
Taylorsville Xpwy	5,600 Total Units
4700 S/I-215	450 New Units
5400 S	
Bangerter	500 New Units
4800 S Redwood	300 New Units
Crossroads	428 Proposed New Units
10% Elsewhere	750 New Units
Total	8159 New Units

Mr. McGrath listed several site-specific planning areas within the city:

- 2700 West/I-215/4700 South
- 4800 South Redwood Rd
- 4800 South Historic District
- Center Point: 5400 South Redwood Rd
- Redwood Rd south of I-215
- West Point: 4000 West / Bangerter Hwy / 5400 South
- Westbrook Elementary School
- Taylorsville Expressway Station Area Plan

Chapter 2: Community Character

Community character referred to the elements that made a community unique among its neighbors. Some examples were streetscapes, building design and orientation, site design and landscaping, public art, celebrating community, gateways and wayfinding, community branding, and history and historic preservation. Mr. McGrath reviewed each element and discussed in what ways they had been incorporated thus far.

Chapter 9: Environmental Stewardship

This chapter was new to the General Plan. Ms. Bergeson explained that her PowerPoint presentation listed it as Chapter 11, but it had since been changed to Chapter 9. This chapter would initially be divided into the following sections:

- Water Conservation
- Emergency Mitigation and Recovery
- Urban Forest
- Preservation of Natural Amenities
- Mitigating Environmental Impacts Using Green Infrastructure
- Waste Management and Recycling

Senate Bill 110 was passed by the legislature in 2022 and addressed the effects of permitted development on water use, methods to reduce demand for existing development, methods to reduce demand for future development, and opportunities for municipalities to modify operations. Some other requirements had already been accommodated with code updates regarding landscaping and water use. The city was

getting further input from the Taylorsville Bennion Improvement District and from the Department of Natural Resources.

Taylorsville used 156 annual gallons of water per capita but there was definitely room for improvement in the summer months when that amount increased to 400 gallons per capita. Ms. Bergeson described several methods to reduce water demand for both existing and future development. She also briefly described some opportunities the city had to modify operations in order to use water more wisely.

Regarding emergency mitigation and recovery, Ms. Bergeson touched on a variety of areas that would be addressed in this chapter. They included earthquakes, flooding, radon and heat. She discussed various ways the city could mitigate environmental impacts by using green infrastructure and concluding her comments by addressing waste management and recycling.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSIONS

Commissioner Russell to report on the City Council meeting held August 7, 2024

 Commissioner Russell had been unable to attend the meeting. However, he asked Mr. Spung to summarize the item regarding vehicles and trailers on larger residential lots which he did.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and Chair Wilkey declared the meeting adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 11:04 p.m.

Jamie Brooks, City Recorder