

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 22, 2025
Pre-meeting – 6:00 p.m. / Regular Session – 6:30 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance-

Planning Commission

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

Community Development Staff

Terryne Bergeson - Planner
Jamie Brooks – City Recorder
Wayne Harper- Comm/Econ. Dev. Director
Mark McGrath – Long-Range Planner
Jim Spung – Senior Planner

Excused: Chair Don Russell and Commissioner Lynette Wendel

Others Present: Ernest Burgess, Paxton Guymon, Kelly Guymon, and Brandon Watson

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

Senior Planner Jim Spung mentioned that the March 25th meeting minutes were approved in error during the April 8th meeting since they had not yet been completed. However, they were now on that evening's agenda for review and approval.

He then provided a brief overview of Agenda Item #3 (File 2S25), explaining that most of the heavy lifting had taken place previously, and that it was now time for the various aspects of subdivision approval involving the engineering and construction-level drawings, checking to ensure the plat matches the master plan, etc.

Commissioner Young asked about getting water and sewer service to the development since at the previous public hearing, that had been a concern of nearby residents. Mr. Spung displayed a copy of the utility plan, which depicted an underground storm detention system which would discharge into the city's system at a certain rate so that it did not overwhelm it. The city engineer had approved the plan, although he wished to have the site re-graded so that there would be less of a difference between the elevation of the existing homes and the new properties within Taylor Villas. Additionally, there would be a series of berms, swales and a wall to ensure that any water not directed into the underwater system would be sent to the low point on the property and not to nearby homes.

Regarding the General Plan. Mr. Spung explained that all chapters had now been delivered to the Planning Commission. Chapters 5 and 7 had been revised and posted for their review.

Community/Economic Development Director Wayne Harper then updated the Planning Commission regarding various businesses in town before responding to specific questions.

June ribbon-cuttings were anticipated for Phase I of Taylorsville Park and Summit Park improvements.

The briefing session adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 P.M.

Chair McElreath opened the regular meeting at 6:32 p.m. and read the welcome statement.

CONSENT AGENDA

- | |
|---|
| 2. Review/Approval of the Minutes for March 25, 2025. |
|---|

Commissioner Wright mentioned that his comments regarding water conservation and trees along the canals had been omitted. City Recorder Jamie Brooks responded that she recalled listing his comments in bullet-point form, but that she would be happy to review the recording again.

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to table the minutes of the March 25th meeting to the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkey and passed unanimously.

SUBDIVISION (Administrative Action)

- | |
|---|
| 3. Public Hearing and Consideration of Preliminary Subdivision Approval to Create 50 Residential Lots on 5.3 Acres of Property at 4027 West and 4035 West 6200 South in Taylorsville, Utah; (File 2S25 – SUB-000512-2025; Applicant: Emily Call, Edge Homes; Jim Spung, Presenting) |
|---|

 Mr. Spung explained that it was time for preliminary subdivision approval and site plan review which involved reviewing the detailed construction level drawings needed to approve development permits. The General Plan map designation was high density residential which was approved by the City Council in January. The zoning designation was SSD-R Taylor Villas which was created specifically for this project and approved by the Planning Commission in late 2024 and the City Council in January.

The staff's review criteria (12 standards) were outlined in the staff report, and the development was in compliance, pending a few outstanding comments. Despite notices being issued to affected entities and residents within 300' of the subject property and placed on websites for both the city and the State of Utah, no public comments had been received as of April 18th.

He addressed the utility plan as he had outlined it in the briefing session. Commissioner Wright asked where the overflow would go. Mr. Spung indicated he would have the applicant answer that question when he spoke to the Commission. There had been few changes to the landscape plan, although some of the tree species had been changed. He displayed the fencing plan and mentioned that staff had requested a photometric plan in order to ensure there would be adequate levels at night for safety reasons. The City Engineer had also requested that the applicant look at the retaining walls proposed on the south and east sides of the property to ensure that they were designed in a way to support the pre-cast fence.

Staff recommended the following conditions of approval:

- 1- All outstanding city department and review agency comments were to be resolved, and subsequent revisions were to comply with applicable city ordinances, codes, and standards prior to plat recording.
- 2- The plat was to be compliant with all requirements and standards of Salt Lake County.
- 3- All required fees and bonds were to be paid to the city.

Staff recommended approval.

There were no questions from the planning commission.

Chair McElreath invited Brandon Watson to address the commission. He was the in-house engineer for Edge Homes and was present on behalf of Emily Call. He explained that although it was somewhat counterintuitive, the storm drain was on the higher end of the property and all the piping sloped downward to the northwest which would be the overflow pattern (in answer to Commissioner Wright's earlier question.) Utility and drainage easements would be recorded around all of the lots and storm drain boxes would be placed on lots 44 and 45.

Commissioner Wright had clarifying questions regarding drainage.

Mr. Watson described the townhomes as "alley-loaded," 3-bedroom, 2.5 bath, with unfinished basements. As for the single-family homes, they would range from 2300-3500 square feet, 3-6 bedrooms depending on the elevations and options chosen by the buyers.

Commissioner Wright said he liked the development and was curious about the south side, how it was being built up and where the retaining wall would be in relation to the property line, etc. Mr. Watson responded that the wall would go where the park was—at

the southeast corner of lot 44 and a wall would go from there to the very southeast corner, and then it would go to the corner of lot 45. The new lots would be lower than the neighbors to the south in order to ensure that Taylor Villa water did not drain into the neighbor's backyards. Finally, a swale from lot 50 down to lot 45 would be picked up by a catch basin. Lots 42 to 44 would drain to another catch basin which would eventually go into the detention pond.

Commissioner Wright and Mr. Watson discussed clarifying questions pertaining to the location of the retaining walls, none of which would exceed 4' high.

Chair McElreath opened the public hearing. However, there was no one who expressed a desire to speak, so the Chair closed the public hearing.

Commission Wright was relieved to learn that the south retaining wall would not continue along the entire length. He expressed concern about a specific existing home. Mr. Watson responded that the engineers had recommended placing all the detention chambers underground. The park was sloped to reduce the wall height.

Mr. Spung mentioned that someone watching the meeting online asked that the traffic study be addressed. He explained that it showed that the development was not likely to result in any substantive changes to traffic flow in the neighborhood. In addition to an online question about parking, he indicated that each unit would have four off-street parking spaces and there would be 21 visitor spaces for the project. Any parking issues that arose on site would be managed by the homeowner's association since it was private property.

In response to a question about construction, Mr. Watson was asked if he had an estimate for construction completion. He responded that their plan was to construct the project in a single phase, and that as soon as they had final engineering approval, they planned to begin. He expected it to take about a year total to complete.

Commissioner Quigley thanked the applicant for managing to include some single-family homes in this development. He felt it created an effective buffer to the neighboring community.

MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to approve File 2S25 / SUB-000512-2025, a preliminary subdivision plat creating 50 residential lots on 5.318-acres of property located at 4027 West and 4035 West 6200 South in Taylorsville, subject to the findings and conditions outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright.

Commissioner Wilkey:	Yes
Commissioner Willardson:	Yes
Commissioner Wright:	Yes
Chair McElreath:	Yes
Commissioner Quigley:	Yes

Commissioner Young: Yes

Motion Passed 6-0

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT – (Legislative Action)

4. Review and Recommendation to the City Council for a Comprehensive Update to Taylorsville's General Plan; (File No: 3G23-GPLAN-000440-2024; City of Taylorsville, Applicant; Mark McGrath, Presenter)

 Mr. McGrath wished to focus on Chapters 5 and 7—the last two to be developed in the update.

Chapter 7 - Neighborhoods

He began by reviewing the document's overall guiding principles and fundamental strategies. He displayed a table which depicted the year in which all Taylorsville dwellings were first constructed. It illustrated the fact that almost 60% of them were built between 1970 and 1990, the result being that the majority of homes were aging at the same pace which would present some challenges.

Mr. McGrath stated that while many people seemed to believe that Taylorsville had more than its share of multi-family developments, actual data did not support that. In fact, 70.4% of its residential structures were single-family homes while 25.6% were multi-family and 4% were mobile homes. Additionally, 70% of the homes were owner occupied while 30% were occupied by renters. These statistics were as of the 2020 census and did not account for those renting without a license to do so.

Commissioner Wilkey wondered how to quantify those homes in the city that were owner occupied but which also had a portion of the home rented by non-family members (with or without a license to do so.) Mr. McGrath agreed that it was difficult to quantify but it was becoming more and more common. Some other information which came out of census data was the fact that there were many 1-person households in Taylorsville—more than there were 3-person households, in fact. In 1990, more than half of our households had children under 18 years of age. By 2010, that number had dropped to only 39% and by 2020, it was only 34.8%. As for Taylorsville's older residents, about 6% of them were 65 years of age or older in the 2000 census. However, by 2020, that number had more than doubled.

In 1990, the city's non-white population was less than 10% of the city's overall population but by 2010 it had jumped to 25% and according to the American Community Survey, it was at now 40%.

Regarding neighborhood identity and character, which was considered part of Taylorsville's overall vision, Commissioner Wright asked how Mr. McGrath felt the General Plan helped the city work toward that goal.

Mr. McGrath responded that there were some places that seemed to have a natural identity. The Sugarhouse area in Salt Lake City was one example. It had a history and a more distinctive architectural identity. He admitted there was not a lot of that in Taylorsville, but it could happen organically over time with things like improving streetscapes and street lighting, developing architectural design standards for new development projects, etc. In fact, Taylorsville was already in the process of updating its streetlights.

Commissioner Quigly proposed having neighborhood-specific banners placed on those streetlights to help identify different communities within Taylorsville.

Commissioner Wright recommended creating a committee designated to address the goals of this particular chapter. Mr. McGrath said there was a recommendation in one of the previous chapters that there be a committee whose sole purpose was to review the General Plan on an annual basis and ensure that it did not languish but instead that the city continued to do whatever it could to move towards the goals outlined within it.

Commissioner Wright thought that as part of that committee, the city might find that different neighborhoods might become interested in developing the character of their smaller communities.

Commissioner Wilkey mentioned that a 2008 article was referenced and although she agreed with its content, she wondered if a more recent article could be found to illustrate the same point. Mr. McGrath agreed, saying that since the information was still very relevant, perhaps he would simply remove the date reference.

Regarding housing diversity and variety, she hoped a chart could be added to help illustrate the points made regarding the missing middle housing and mixed-use communities. Mr. McGrath responded that staff would need to spend some time thinking about how best to do that.

Commissioner Wright mentioned an error in the page numbering of the chapter that it should be 7- rather than 5-. Commissioner Wilkey mentioned she also found some typographical errors that she wrote down for him.

Commissioner Young commented about the need to find a way to enforce ordinances which regulate residential rentals in Taylorsville, although he indicated he was aware of the challenges of doing so. He also felt there might be some opportunities for people to age in place by utilizing ADU's in certain properties, creating more housing stock for families in the underlying single-family home. Mr. McGrath pointed out that there had been discussions at the legislature about potentially mandating cities to allow ADUs. It was a topic that he expected would continue to be addressed annually for the foreseeable future.

Chapter 5 - Economic Prosperity & Resilience

Mr. McGrath reminded the commissioners that they had asked for more specificity in this chapter so some information that had previously been removed from the chapter had now been returned.

Some areas ripe for renewal in the city were:

- 5400 South Bangerter
- 4700 South / 2700 West (including state office complex)
- Taylorsville Expressway
- 4800 South Redwood Road
- Area around Salt Lake Community College
- 5400 South Redwood Road
- I-215 / Redwood Road Area

Mr. Spung explained that many of these areas were once thriving, but it was now time to inject some new life into them as funds became available. Prioritization would be critical.

There was then a discussion about the need for an appealing moniker for some areas within the city that did not yet have one. Chair McElreath asked how much having a plan like this would help convince a property owner to redevelop. Mr. Spung responded that it was particularly helpful to serious developers who saw it as an indicator that the city would be supportive of redevelopment initiatives. Unfortunately, sometimes property owners had no interest in redeveloping or selling their property, and that was where the real challenge was.

Mr. Harper said that developers typically sought a favorable location, economic incentives, and a pro-development city. Although there weren't many incentives available, having the updated general plan in place (as well as an RDA master plan) showed developers that the city would be supportive of efforts to renew many areas within the city.

Mr. Spung mentioned that having the city purchase land and issue a request for proposals to developers seemed to be the most effective way to spur redevelopment. West Valley had done it very effectively with their city center.

Commissioner Wright asked Mr. Harper how active the redevelopment agency was. Mr. Harper responded that there were three active RDA project areas, and those funds had been used for parks, utility improvements, roads, etc. There were two other project areas that had been approved but were inactive.

Commissioner Wright wondered who exactly the RDA was. Mr. Harper explained that it was created by statute, and the governing board was the city council, the CEO was the city administrator and he (Mr. Harper) was the director.

Commissioner Wright then asked, "What is the economic trajectory that Taylorsville is on right now?" He clarified that he wished to know if we were growing economically and if

we were, was our growth sustainable? Mr. McGrath responded that it was difficult to calculate, pointing out that commercial business had changed significantly and that no community could honestly say that brick and mortar business was on a growth trajectory.

Mr. Harper said there was a less than 5% vacancy in the city's retail space, while COVID took Sorenson Research Park from 96% full to slightly below 50%. Even now, it was still only back up to 60%. Online sales brought sales tax revenue to wherever the person lived. So, discussing housing and residential growth was definitely a piece of the economic development pie.

Commissioner Wright recommended including a chart to depict our tax base and then reviewing it down the road to measure any changes. He also thought that perhaps it made sense to increase the size of the economic development staff, particularly with someone who had a strong financial background.

Commissioner Young agreed that Taylorsville needed to step up its efforts regarding economic development as had happened in some other nearby communities. But it would require aggressive action.

Mr. McGrath responded that everyone agreed that Taylorsville could boast an excellent, central location. But many of its shopping centers still bore the look of the 1970s when retail was completely different than it is today.

Commissioner Young said that perhaps the city needed to focus on trying to acquire some of those properties. Mr. McGrath commented that was what West Valley had done but that it was a very long-term process with incremental steps taken over thirty years which involved some financial incentives.

Commissioner Wright commented that "a vision doesn't just show up." Instead, we must work aggressively towards it rather than passively waiting for it. He wondered what other cities were spending on economic development.

Commissioner Wilkey pointed out that according to a chart contained within the chapter, Taylorsville was third from the bottom in per capita sales tax generation compared with other communities in Salt Lake County. She wondered what the other communities were doing that Taylorsville was not and felt it was time to set some new goals to improve that position.

Mr. McGrath responded that the figures in the chart were from 2018 and although Shopko had left since then, it had been replaced by Target. So our numbers had likely not changed much. Mr. Spung added that South Salt Lake had the benefit of car dealerships where a single sale resulted in a nice chunk of revenue for the city.

Mr. Harper pointed out that customers tended to prefer new development over those that were rehabbed, and there were property owners who chose not to redevelop their

properties. Still, Target, PetCo and several others had left neighboring cities and come to Taylorsville because they recognized the wisdom of doing so. We have a philosophy and practice of supporting businesses to succeed but typically did not choose to purchase property. Other cities chose to purchase property with the intent that eventually it would develop into something great. Each city had its own challenges and its own philosophies regarding development.

Commissioner Wilkey indicated she would love to see SMART goals—those that were specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound. Mr. McGrath responded that he and Mr. Spung had discussed the difficulty of measuring success with this plan.

Commissioner Quigley felt it was time to get the plan to the City Council for their review and input. Chair McElreath agreed.

Commissioner Wright wished to see the economic development chapter expanded. Commissioner Wilkey indicated she had not quite finished the land use chapter but would vote to forward a recommendation if everyone else was ready.

MOTION: Commissioner Wilkey moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for their May 7 meeting with the ability for the planning commissioners to get any final recommendations and edits to Mr. McGrath by April 30th. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Willardson and passed unanimously.

Commissioner Quigley congratulated Mr. McGrath and pointed out that it was a compliment to both the Commission and the entire planning staff that this passed on a unanimous vote.

MOTION: Chair McElreath moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed unanimously at 8:22 p.m.


Jamie Brooks, MMC
City Recorder



