# City of Taylorsville
# Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
# December 10, 2024
# Regular Meeting – 6:00 p.m.
# 2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

---

**Attendance-**

**Planning Commission**
Don Russell – Vice Chair
Don Quigley
Lynette Wendel
Gordon Willardson
David Wright
David Young (Arrived at 7:40 p.m.)

**Community Development Staff**
Mark McGrath –Long-Range Planner
Jim Spung – Senior Planner
Terryne Bergeson, Planner
Jamie Brooks, City Recorder

**Excused:** Chair Wilkey and Commissioner McElreath

**Citizens/Guests Present**: Miguel Alpizar, Lenny Barker, Gea Bell, Michelle Bell, Cathy Blumenkrantz, Dennis Blumenkrantz, Debbie Bona, Joey Bona, Tiffany Bona, Ernest Burgess, Michelle Butterfield, Wes Butterfield, Megan Cannon, Deborah Combs, Preston Croxford, Bobbi Ellis, Gary Ellis, Kelly Guymon, Paxton Guymon, Jess Hansen, Shanna Hansen, Jarl Jacobson, Ruth Jacobson, David Knowlton, Bob Knudsen, Dayana Ludlow, Barb Munoz, Wayne Nichol, Brady Patterson, Jerry Paul, David Shaw, Jodi Sieg, Jacquie Smith, and Monte Watkins

## 1. PRE-MEETING – 6:00 P.M.

Vice Chair Russell called the pre-meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Chair Wilkey and Commissioner McElreath were excused, while Commissioner Young would be delayed.

Senior Planner Jim Spung explained that regarding Agenda Items #2 and #3, the applicant had come up with an Option 2 of only single-family residences that he wished to be considered if the Planning Commission declined to forward a positive recommendation on the original version which included a mixture of townhomes and single-family residences. The City was still in favor of the original, site-specific designation because it provided additional benefits to Taylorsville.

Commissioner Wendel expressed concern about a letter from Steve Waldrip which accompanied the application. (Mr. Waldrip was the Senior Advisor for Housing Strategy and Innovation for Gov. Spencer Cox.) Specifically, it was suggested in the letter that the developer had indicated 60% of the units would qualify for the state-sponsored $20,000 down payment assistance program. If that was the case, it appeared the current proposal fell far short of that. Mr. Spung displayed the letter on the large screen, and the applicant

realized that it was the incorrect version of the letter. Mr. Spung later forwarded the correct version to the Planning Commissioners. Currently Mr. Guymon had committed that six of the townhomes would be eligible for the grant program and Mr. Spung had suggested to him that the City Council would likely require more than that in order to support the proposal.

Planner Terryne Bergeson then provided a brief overview of File #32C24 which was a request for a conditional use permit to operate a used car dealership at 4768 South Redwood Road. Staff would be recommending approval but with the condition that the applicant submit a new site plan removing the display parking area because the intended space could not be used for that purpose or for parking.

Commissioner Wendel inquired about the pylon sign that was currently on site. Ms. Bergeson indicated she had already informed the applicant that it could not be used but instead would need to be removed. Commissioner Wendel asked that he be informed of his options for signage.

Ms. Bergeson then reviewed Files #2S24 and #7C24 regarding consideration for a preliminary subdivision approval to create a condominium plat and conditional use site plan for a small mixed-use project at 4255 South Redwood Road. The subject property was landlocked and located behind AutoZone and Family Dollar. The applicant proposed a 6,297 square foot mixed-use structure with three commercial units on the ground floor and five residential units on the second floor, including rooftop patios. They wished to make them available for private ownership which required a condominium plat. The property would be accessed through a 25' access easement through the AutoZone parking lot. Storm water would be managed on site with a StormTech underwater chamber system that the city engineer had approved. The site had 18 parking spaces for the commercial uses, two per residential unit and two guest stalls.

The pre-meeting session concluded at 6:37 p.m.

## CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION

Commissioner Wright – November 20, 2024
Commissioner Russell – December 4, 2024

Commissioners Wright and Russell provided brief overviews of the November 20, 2024 and December 4, 2024 City Council meetings.

## GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 P.M.

Vice Chair Russell called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m., explaining that Chair Wilkey and Commissioner McElreath had been excused. He then read the opening statement.

## CONSENT AGENDA

2. Review/Approval of the Minutes for the November 12, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

**MOTION: Commissioner Wendel moved to approve the minutes from the November 12, 2024 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed unanimously.**

**GENERAL PLAN MAP AMENDMENT (Legislative Action)**

1. Recommendation to the City Council for a General Plan Map Amendment for 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; Applicant: Paxton Guymon, PKEG Investments, LLC; Jim Spung, Senior Planner

**ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT (Legislative Action)**

2. 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

**ZONING MAP AMENDMENT (Legislative Action)**

3. Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Map Amendment for 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 Taylors Villas); File 7Z24 – DCA-000484-2024; Jim Spung, Senior Planner

Mr. Spung made a single presentation for all three related agenda items. He explained that the required public hearing had been held on November 12th and therefore, the city was not required to hold a second one that evening. However, the Planning Commission could do so if they wished. Commissioner Wright felt it was important to hear from the public again.

The applicant had made adjustments based on previous feedback from the public, staff, and planning commissioners. He now proposed 41 townhomes and 9 single-family homes for a total of 50 residential units, and the open space had been increased as suggested by staff. Additional changes were: the middle building now had four units instead of three; a townhouse had been eliminated in order to provide additional buffering on the street, additional sidewalk was provided, connecting 3975 West internal to the project; park strips had been added along the single-family dwellings on both the east and the south sides;

and one lot was eliminated from the south boundary which made room for a larger open space area and slightly larger lots and guest parking.

Mr. Spung outlined the many benefits this project would bring to the city:

- 50 new residential units in the City
- A minimum of 6 townhomes that would participate in the First-Time Home Buyers Assistance Program
- Five-year deed restriction requiring homeowner occupancy from the date of initial purchase
- The Codes Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs) would limit rentals to 10 units at any given time after the initial 5-year period. City approval would be required for any amendment to the CC&Rs.
- A privately owned and maintained amenity and park space (10% of the project area) provided for the residents
- The SSD concept promoted more efficient use of land and existing infrastructure
- The project would feature enhanced urban design qualities (e.g. front building facades facing public streets, rear-loaded garages, wider sidewalks, enhanced architectural quality, consistent park strip landscape, additional pedestrian connectivity, etc.) not otherwise required with a traditional residential zoning designation
- The project provided 21 parking spaces beyond what the city's base zoning required, minimizing risk of spill-over parking on streets in the neighborhood
- New infrastructure would be privately owned and maintained by the HOA—no extra cost burden to taxpayers to service the additional units.
- The project would increase the city's annual property tax revenue by approximately $11,000 from what it was currently. (A project developed under a traditional residential zone would bring in about $8,400 in tax revenue but would require city maintenance for public streets and infrastructure
- An increase in population supported the validity for future retail and/or commercial opportunities adjacent to the nearby Summit Vista project
- The project would bring about 150 new residents to the city, resulting in the potential for over $62,000 in additional sales tax revenue each year
- The project would include a new high-quality fence/wall along the east and south boundaries of the project, benefitting existing homeowners
- The existing private drive on 6200 South would be eliminated, resulting in fewer vehicle conflict points and more efficient traffic flow
- It would enhance the visual aesthetic and gateway of the city and neighborhood, mitigating on-going concerns related to dust, rodents and odors associated with the current land use.

Unique features of the proposed development were the size of the lots (between 4,653 and 5,408 square feet), alley-loaded townhouses, and modified street cross-sections.

Due to the traffic concerns expressed in the November public hearing, the applicant had asked Hales Engineering to update their traffic study and include the intersection of Hazy Way and 3975 West. The study now estimated 26 trips during morning peak hours, 34

during evening peak hours and about 374 weekday daily trips. It was worth noting that single-family homes could be expected to generate twice the number of daily trips than would a townhome. In short, the engineer anticipated that all intersections included in the study would operate at an acceptable level with minimal impact from the proposed development. Mr. Spung mentioned that there was a Hales Engineering representative present via Zoom if there were any questions about the study.

Regarding parking, each residential unit would have four dedicated parking spaces—two in the garage and two in the driveway which would be longer than standard driveways. These spaces were in addition to 21 common parking spaces for guests.

The open space now proposed for the project had doubled in size from what was previously proposed, for 19,550 square feet, or 11% of the project area.

In the event that the Planning Commission declined to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the project as now described, the applicant had submitted a "Option 2" concept which eliminated all townhomes and proposed 30 single-family homes. It was important to note that with that proposal, the city would not have the option of limiting the number of rental units that were allowed at any given time.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation of the updated proposal (not Option 2). It was also recommended that the applicant continue to work with staff in preparation for presenting the project to the City Council.

Commissioner Wendel spoke to the uniqueness of the SSD as a tool for land development in the city. She explained this was the city's best opportunity to preserve the single-family neighborhoods in the community and meet the current housing demands.

Mr. Spung pointed out that the letter from Steve Waldrip included in the packet was out of date. He had since emailed the updated version to the commissioners and provided one to the city recorder for inclusion in the permanent record.

Commissioner Quigley expressed concern that only six of the townhomes would be eligible for the down-payment assistance program. Mr. Spung indicated that the applicant could speak to that when he addressed the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Willardson commented that few garages accommodated two cars because so many people used the space for storage of personal property. Therefore, he did not feel each unit necessarily had 4.5 parking spaces when all was said and done. He felt it made more sense to put single-family homes on the subject property. Mr. Spung pointed out that building only single-family homes would not result in an increased number of parking spaces.

Commissioner Wendel stated that this project proposed more parking per living unit than she had ever seen in her nine years on the planning commission, other than homes with

three-car garages. Mr. Spung added that the State legislature was considering a bill which would limit requiring *any* parking in some types of residential development.

Vice Chair Russell invited the applicant to step forward and address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Paxton Guymon explained that his goal was to find a balance between a project that worked financially while also meeting the desires of the neighbors, the direction provided by city staff, and contributed to the community.

He pointed out that there was more space for parking than city code required and that "you won't see that much in any new development in Salt Lake County." He explained that he had initially proposed 63 townhomes and no single-family residences; he had adjusted down to the current proposal of 41 townhomes and 9 single-family homes. He indicated that if he could provide more than 6 of the townhomes so that they would be eligible for the $20,000 down-payment assistance, he certainly would. But he had reduced the number of townhomes to alleviate concerns expressed by staff and/or neighbors, and that meant fewer units would qualify for that program. Building a new park strip and sidewalk, giving up three lots in order to increase the amount of open space, having 4.4 parking spaces per home—all cut in to his ability to meet the price point which would qualify for the housing assistance. He felt that the current iteration of his plan (41 townhomes and 9 single-family residences) was a good compromise. If the Planning Commission disagreed, he could file a new application to instead build 50 single-family homes with a price point between $600k-$700k each.

Commissioner Quigley pointed out how accommodating the applicant had been and how talented the planning staff was. He greatly appreciated all the steps that had been taken to ensure this was a quality project.

Vice Chair Russell asked how long it would take to build with either plan. Mr. Guymon indicated it would be a two-year process regardless of whether he built a combination of townhomes and single-family or if he built all single-family homes.

Commissioner Wendel said she understood that single-family homes would not qualify for the assistance program. She felt it was important to recognize the importance of planning for our children and grandchildren—to make decisions today that would work for them tomorrow. Still, she asked what Mr. Guymon would need in order to ensure that ten townhomes were priced no higher than $450,000. He responded that he would need two more lots to do so.

Vice Chair Russel opened the public comment period.

Barbra Munoz explained that she had been a Taylorsville resident for 24 years. She thanked the applicant for working with the neighbors and hearing their concerns. She described the changes to the project as "fantastic" and admitted that single-family homes

were not a housing panacea because they often had problems as well. She felt the developer had acted in good faith and was in support of either of his proposals.

David Shaw spoke in favor of Option 2—the 30 single-family residences. He pointed out the property was zoned for single-family homes and that should be what is built. He also mentioned that he disagreed with the traffic impact study.

Gary Ellis spoke in favor of building homes to match what was already there. He also felt that traffic in the area was a problem 24/7 and would only increase with this development. He felt the lots should be bigger and "more appealing."

Dennis Blumenkrantz said he appreciated the "sales speech" but did not feel the proposal fit what was currently there. He said the developer's goal was to get the highest return on his investment. He believed that by the time these homes were ready to sell, there would no longer be any money in the down-payment assistance program.

Commissioner Young arrived at 7:40 p.m.

Debbie Bona said she had lived in the neighborhood for 37 years. She described the project as "too much." She reported a high number of accidents on 6200 South, with three more occurring since the last planning commission meeting.

Megan Cannon had lived in the neighborhood for forty years. She asked for the proposal to build thirty single-family homes to be approved rather than the one that included townhomes, saying that townhomes were not what the community needed there. She wished for the neighborhood to remain as it was.

Jess Hansen appreciated the developer for being so much more accommodating than most developers typically were. His primary concern remained increased traffic.

Jarl Jacobson was concerned that someone could buy a townhome and invite others to live with them. He felt the townhomes would bring more traffic than would single-family homes and asked the planning commission to strongly consider the proposal to *only* build single-family homes.

Wayne Nichol explained that his mother owned property adjacent to this project. He had entertained offers for this property for thirty years and had chosen to sell to the Mr. Guymon because he showed more concern than anyone else. He asked that the Planning Commission approve the proposal because it would be "the best for everybody." He said that the traffic problems were not on the developer and that people were not listening to the traffic experts.

Vice Chair Russell closed the public comment period at 7:51 p.m.

Mr. Spung read an email from Brandy Patterson who had to leave prior to the public comment period. She preferred a mix of townhomes and single-family homes due to the housing crisis and felt speed humps were "long past due."

Mr. Spung then mentioned that the traffic engineer was online if there were any questions for him.

Commissioner Wright wished to hear from him regarding the reasoning behind the numbers presented in the traffic study. He also hoped to hear any recommendations to address traffic issues in the neighborhood.

Jordi Berrett of Hales Engineering spoke via a Zoom connection. He indicated that their study agreed with national data suggesting that townhomes typically generated fewer daily trips and fewer peak-hour trips than did a single-family home. This was because townhomes tended to be occupied either by first-time homeowners who had not yet had children who drove, or retired individuals who had no other drivers living with them. He did not anticipate this project having much impact on traffic in the area. He also mentioned that his firm would be willing to help the city address current traffic issues.

Commissioner Willardson asked Mr. Berrett how Hales had gone about counting cars. Mr. Berrett responded that there were people onsite between 7am and 9am and again between 4pm and 6pm to visually count the vehicles.

Mr. Spung pointed out that Exhibit H in the agenda packet included detailed counts of each traffic movement at each intersection at different times of the day. It was a roughly 40-page document that included all the analysis and data, and was available for review.

Commissioner Wright had found the presentation helpful and said he was relying on the professional engineers and what they anticipated the effect of this project on area traffic to be. He found himself looking more favorably upon the proposal than he previously had. He asked Mr. Spung about previous analysis of traffic in the area.

Mr. Spung responded that he had spoken with city engineer Ben White since the November meeting and Mr. White was very familiar with the nearby traffic issues. He had previously explored installing speed bumps, but pointed out that typically residents asked for them to be removed within a year for a variety of reasons, including an increase in vehicle damage and accidents. Because of that, Mr. White did not recommend them, and Mr. Spung pointed out that the city had previously added some elsewhere and had already removed them.

Commissioner Wright asked that the decision not to install them be reconsidered.

Commissioner Wendel stated that any neighborhood in the city could complain about traffic and speed problems. It was a problem everywhere and was a separate issue. She wished to focus on the application currently under consideration, saying that everyone seemed to want people to live the way they themselves lived. The question was do we

want to provide parking for people or shelter for them? Providing shelter was the priority, and the SSD had made Summit Vista possible just as it could be effective here. She felt this was a wonderful project and would be far better than the type of housing which might soon be allowed by the state legislature. She greatly appreciated all the feedback that had come from the community which had resulted in many concessions by the applicant.

Commissioner Quigley pointed out the challenge of balancing what the community wanted with what it needed. Speeding was a problem unrelated to this development. He stated it was important to look at Taylorsville's future. He felt this was a responsible development which had evolved significantly based on the neighbors' input. He hoped the nearby residents could see the need for both sides to yield somewhat. He indicated he was in support of the proposal.

Commissioner Willardson said he tried to put himself in the shoes of those living in the neighborhood. He felt the neighbors should have what they wanted since it was their neighborhood.

Commissioner Wright spoke to the proposed landscaping within the project, pointing out how long it took for gingko trees to grow. If the applicant was set on planting them, he suggested he purchase those that were more mature. He also felt that the amount of green lawn should be reduced so as to be more water wise. Perhaps a half basketball court could be installed in lieu of some of the grass.

Commissioner Wendel mentioned that the Planning Commission could recommend the proposal increase the number of units that would qualify for the down payment assistance program.

**MOTION:** **Commissioner Wendel moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #2G24-GPLAN-000486-2024, for a General Plan Map Amendment from Low-Density Residential to High-Density Residential; File #6Z24-DCA-000485-2024 for a Zoning Text Amendment to Chapter 13.44 of the Taylorsville Municipal Code, Adopting Standards for the SSD-R Taylor Villas Zoning District; and File #7Z24-DCA-000484-2024, a Zoning Map Amendment from Single-Family Residential (R-1-40) to Site-Specific Development Residential (SSD-R Taylor Villas), all pertaining to 5.3 Acres of Property at 4027 West and 4035 West 6200 South; <u>including a recommendation that at least eight units qualify for the grant program through the State of Utah.</u> The motion was seconded by Commissioner Quigley.**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Commissioner Wendel** | **Aye** |
| **Commissioner Quigley** | **Aye** |
| **Commissioner Wright** | **Aye** |
| **Vice Chair Russell** | **Aye** |
| **Commissioner Willardson** | **No** |
| **Commissioner Young** | **Abstained** |

**Motion Passed 4-1**

Commissioner Young stated he would abstain since he had not been present for the entire meeting.

Vice Chair Russell expressed his appreciation to the members of the public who had taken the time to attend the meeting and share their opinions.

## CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS (Administrative Action)

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. | Public Hearing and Consideration of Non-Administrative Conditional Use Permit to Operate a Used Car Dealership at 4768 South Redwood Road in Taylorsville, Utah; File #32C24 – CUP-000493-2024; Terryne Bergeson, Planner |

Ms. Bergeson explained that the applicant's rezone request had been approved earlier in the year, making a used car dealership eligible for a non-administrative conditional use permit here. The applicant did not plan any significant improvements on the site or to the building.

The pylon sign currently in place was non-compliant and would need to be removed. The applicants wished to use the front of the property to display vehicles for sale, but that would not be possible since city code required a display area to be 40' from a driveway, and it did not meet that criterion. They had also suggested they use that area for parking, but there was insufficient room for the required back-out space.

Public within 300' of this property had been notified of the application. Only one comment had been received, and that resident did not wish the application to be approved because she was concerned that "additional car noise will increase the dogs barking" in the neighborhood.

Staff recommended approval with the following conditions:

1) The applicant shall submit a site plan showing the twenty spaces and removal of the orange display area in Exhibit G of the staff report prior to final approval.
2) The existing pylon sign must be removed but could be replaced with updated signage that met applicable standards in city code Chapter 13.26 with approval of a building permit.
3) Any parking on the site shall comply with standards in the Taylorsville Land Development Code.
4) The rear, undeveloped portion of the lot shall not be used for storage of vehicles.
5) Storage of inoperable vehicles is prohibited.
6) The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all applicable standards, prior to issuance of business license.

Commissioner Wright asked what the plan was for the rear, undeveloped portion of the lot. Ms. Bergeson responded that the applicant did not currently have any plans to develop that area. She reiterated that one of the conditions of approval was that it not be used for the storage of vehicles.

Vice Chair Russell invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Elias Caňas introduced himself and indicated he did not have immediate plans to do anything in the rear of the property, but that might change down the road.

Commissioner Quigley asked him how many cars would be kept on site. Mr. Caňas anticipated that to be approximately 20, explaining that he had an additional yard at another location. He would prefer to display cars in the front but would comply with the prohibition.

The applicant and Commissioner Wendel both pointed out that the building directly south of the subject property appeared to allow vehicles to be parked in front. Ms. Bergeson believed that had been grandfathered in as it did not appear on any approved site plans. Any new application was required to comply with the current standards which meant that there could be no vehicles in front.

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

Commission Quigley pointed out that there had been a similar application across the street years ago and that the business had eventually folded because the applicant had been prohibited from doing what he needed to do in order to be successful. He was concerned that this business would experience something similar. He wished to ensure that the applicant was very clear about the fact that he could not have any inventory in the front and that he had to remove the large sign. He felt it would be very difficult for the business to succeed with those conditions. He did not wish to create a code enforcement situation with a business that kept thinking they could push the envelope.

Mr. Caňas said he understood the restrictions and that he would stick to the rules because he wanted to be at that location. In short, he would make it work.

**MOTION:** **Commissioner Wright moved to approve File #32C24-CUP-000493-2024, a non-administrative conditional use permit to operate a used car dealership at 4768 South Redwood Road in Taylorsville, Utah, subject to the findings and conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Russell and passed unanimously.**

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (Administrative Action)**

5. Public Hearing and Consideration of Preliminary Non-administrative Conditional Use and Site Plan Approval to Construct a Mixed-Use Building at 4255 South Redwood Road in Taylorsville, Utah; File #7C24 – CUP-000493-2024; Terryne Bergeson, Planner

**SUBDIVISION (Administrative Action)**

6. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Preliminary Subdivision Approval to Create Apex Plaza Condominiums at 4255 South Redwood Road in Taylorsville, Utah; File #2S24 – SUB-000442-2024; Terryne Bergeson, Planner

Ms. Bergeson made a single presentation for the next two related agenda items. She explained that the subject property was a landlocked parcel behind Auto Zone and Family Dollar. The applicant proposed a 6,297 mixed-use structure with 3 commercial ground floor units and five residential units, all to be individually owned which required a subdivision condominium plat. There was a 25' access easement going from Redwood Road east through the Auto Zone parking lot before turning north and going in front of the proposed structure and exiting to the north past Family Dollar on 4200 South.

The property was designated as community-commercial on the General Plan, and the parcel was zoned the same. According to the land use table, a mixed-use building required a non-administrative conditional use permit along with a subdivision plat. Stormwater was to be maintained on site underground and there were 30' rear and side setbacks to work with which met the requirement. There was also a 10' side set-back to the north between commercial properties. A 10' landscape buffer was in place around the residential units, and it also provided 6' wide sidewalks in front and along the south.

There would be three commercial spaces on the ground floor with five two-bedroom units on the second. Two-car garages would be located on the ground level with stairway access to the homes upstairs. Architectural plans, renderings and landscaping plans were all in line with the land development code requirements.

The proposed parking exceeded what was required for both commercial and residential development.

As for water service, Taylorsville Bennion Improvement District had indicated that the meters would need to be moved to the southside of the building so that there would be sufficient room for the easement.

Staff recommended approval of the shared parking plan within the site plan, with the condition that the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) include language that more strongly addressed shared parking between the two uses outside of commercial hours to accommodate guests.

Staff recommended ten conditions of approval which were:

1) The applicant was to coordinate with city staff and reviewing agencies to address all outstanding review comments to demonstrate compliance with all applicable standards, prior to final approval.
2) A fault study shall be provided to the Building Department prior to the approval of any development permits.
3) The height of the CMU wall installed on the south border of the site shall match the height of the existing wall extending onto the property on that side.
4) The existing east CMU wall shall be painted a uniform color to improve the appearance of the wall.
5) A grease interceptor shall not be installed.
6) The CC&Rs shall include language that addressed shared parking for residential guests outside of commercial operating hours.
7) Concrete curb to match existing shall be installed along the landscape island abutting the southwest border of property.
8) The existing mature tree abutting property line shall be protected during construction activities.
9) The draft plat must be reviewed and approved by the Salt Lake County Recorder.
10) Any changes to the site shall be considered an amendment and may be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Quigley thought it odd that the rooftop patio would face a parking lot rather than the mountains.

Commissioner Wright pointed out that cars in the northern most garage would have a very difficult time exiting.

Vice Chair Russell invited the applicant to step forward. Dayana Ludlow of Archplex Architects introduced herself and addressed Commissioner Quigley's comment regarding the view.

Vice Chair Russell then opened the public hearing.

Jacquie Smith lived directly south of the subject property. She was excited to see the property being developed but wondered what the wall on the south side of the property would look like. The applicant responded to her from the audience, explaining that it would look like the wall that was nearby and that it would go up fairly early in the construction process.

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

Commissioner Quigley found the proposal very exciting and felt it was a win-win.

**MOTION: Commissioner Wendel moved to approve both File #2S24-SUB-000442-2024 (a Preliminary Subdivision Creating Apex Plaza**

**Condominiums) and File #32C24-CUP-000437-2024 (a Preliminary Non-Administrative Conditional Use and Site Plan Approval to Construct a Mixed-Use Building) at 4255 South Redwood Road in Taylorsville, Utah subject to the findings and conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Quigley and passed unanimously.**

## OTHER MATTERS

| | |
|---|---|
| 7. | Discussion Regarding the Taylorsville General Plan Update Project; Mark McGrath, Long-Range Planner |

Long-Range Planner Mark McGrath explained that he had now introduced all nine chapters of the proposed plan, but he indicated this was not the Commission's last opportunity to address questions/concerns.

The Planning Commission had none, but commended Mr. McGrath for a job well done.

## ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to adjourn. Commissioner Willardson seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.**

Jamie Brooks, City Recorder

CITY OF TAYLORSVILLE INCORPORATED SEAL JULY 1, 1996 STATE OF UTAH