

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 8, 2025
General Meeting – 6:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

Attendance

Planning Commission

Don Russell – Chair
Marc McElreath - Vice Chair
Don Quigley
Barbara Munoz
Cindy Wilkey
Gordon Willardson
David Wright
David Young (Alternate)

Staff

Dina Blaes – Strategic Engagement
Terryne Bergeson - Planner
Jamie Brooks – City Recorder
Jim Spung – Senior Planner

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:00 p.m.

Others in Attendance: Bob Knudsen and Michael Williams

1. Welcome and Introduction of Dina Blaes, Chief of Strategic Engagement

Chair Russell called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and turned the time over to Senior Planner Jim Spung who introduced Dina Blaes and invited her to the podium.

Dina Blaes expressed her enthusiasm to be working with the Taylorsville planning staff and commissioners. She mentioned she had read the general plan thoroughly and was impressed with the level of time and effort put into creating the document.

When asked about her professional background, Ms. Blaes shared that she previously worked as the director of the Office of Regional Development for Salt Lake County for about seven years. Before that, she worked in the private sector as a consultant in urban planning, historic preservation, and real estate finance.

Mr. Spung added that Dina's introduction was humble and that the city was fortunate to have her, given her extensive education, distinguished background, and experience.

2. Briefing Session to Review the Agenda – Terryne Bergeson

Planner Terryne Bergeson provided a brief overview of File 4S25, displaying an aerial view of the property and describing the current zoning and general plan designations. The

45 applicant sought to subdivide and build a duplex as many of the other property owners in
46 the same subdivision had done.

47
48 She explained that the applicant was working his way through staff's first round of
49 comments. Specifically, he needed to get the fire separation installed and approved. Also,
50 the covered patio was too close to the property line, so that would need to be addressed.

51
52 Commissioner Wright asked Ms. Bergeson to expand on the issue with the covered
53 porch. She explained that it was only 1.2' from the property line and needed to be at least
54 5 feet away, so it would need to be adjusted accordingly.

55
56 Regarding File 3S25, in 2022 the property owner got the subdivision plat approved which
57 cleaned up lot lines and zoning and also created lot #103. That was approved and
58 recorded in 2023 and Mr. Halliday now wished to split lot #103 into four new residential
59 lots.

60
61 There were several things that still needed to be addressed by the applicant. City code
62 required a 50' wide public right of way provided but the applicant proposed a 42' private
63 lane and was requesting an exception from the planning commission. She displayed the
64 relevant review criteria and focused on letter **d**. which required the project to comply with
65 applicable dimensional and development standards in the Land Development Code. As
66 proposed, it did not comply, unless the commission voted to grant an exception. She also
67 drew attention to letter **f**. which referenced a need to meet engineering standards.

68
69 Commissioner Quigley asked who would maintain the private lane if an exception were
70 to be granted. Ms. Bergeson responded that it would be the property owner(s).

71
72 The applicant was also requesting an exception on the type of curb and gutter to be built.
73 However, authority to grant that type of exception was vested with the city engineer and
74 he wished for the planning commission to address the other issues before he considered
75 what he viewed as a comparatively minor issue.

76
77 Commissioner Muñoz wished to clarify that the intention was to establish a homeowner's
78 association to handle the maintenance and ensure there was appropriate emergency
79 access if the lane was private. Ms. Bergeson responded that was the applicant's intent
80 and that there would be a note placed on the plat, releasing the city of any responsibility.

81
82 Ms. Bergeson pointed out that public roads needed two points of access unless there was
83 a stub street and a temporary turn around. Also, if there was a private lane, it needed to
84 have a 50' ROW. However, the street was not stubbed as required, they wished it to be
85 private, and there was no 50' ROW.

86
87 Staff had been encouraging the applicant to have a public rather than private road to ease
88 future development but was willing to acquiesce on the size of the ROW.

89

90 Commissioner Quigley then provided a brief review of the June 18, 2025 city council
91 meeting.

92
93
94
95

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 p.m.

96 **Others in Attendance:** Kent Carothers, Katie Castaneda, Dan Davies, Kathy Davies,
97 Jennifer Frazee, Curtis Halliday, Cynthia Halliday, Isaac Halliday, Samuel Halliday, Traci
98 L. Jones, Bob Knudsen, Jim McGowan, Ruth McGowan, Mark Murray, Mary Murray,
99 Cathie Plothow, Steve Plothow, Rod Tye, and Jeff Wood

100
101 Chair Russell read the opening statement at 6:31 p.m.

102
103 Ms. Blaes, Ms. Bergeson and City Recorder Jamie Brooks then took a moment to
104 acknowledge Mr. Spung who would be leaving Taylorsville to accept an exciting
105 opportunity as the Community Development Director for Cottonwood Heights. Each was
106 sorry to see him go but expressed their excitement for his professional opportunity.

107
108 **Consent Agenda**

109
110 3. Review and Approval of the minutes for the May 13 and June 10, 2025 Planning
111 Commission Meetings

112
113 **MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to approve the minutes of the May 13, 2025**
114 **Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded**
115 **by Commissioner McElreath and passed.** (Commissioners Wright, Wilkey
116 and Munoz abstained, as they had not been present for the meeting.)

117
118
119 **MOTION: Commissioner Wilkey moved to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2025**
120 **Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded**
121 **by Commissioner Muñoz and passed.** (Chair Russell and Commissioner
122 Wright abstained, as they had not been present for the meeting.)

123
124 **Subdivisions (Administrative Action)**

125
126
127
128
129
130

4. Public Hearing and Consideration of Preliminary Subdivision Approval for a Two-Family Lot Split at 4717 South and 4719 South Cathay Circle in Taylorsville, Utah; File 4S25 – SUB-000525-2025; Terryne Bergeson, Planner

126
127 Terryne Bergeson presented the application for a subdivision plat amendment to allow a
128 two-family lot split for the properties located at 4719 and 4717 South Cafe Circle in
129 Taylorsville, Utah. The applicant was Bill Weston Beltran on behalf of the property owner,
130 Michael Williams, who was present at the meeting.

131 Ms. Bergeson explained that the property was part of the Xanadu subdivision developed
132 in the 1980s. The property was zoned R-2-8, which allowed a two-family home on a lot
133 with a minimum of 8,000 square feet. The R-2-8 zone also allowed twin homes on a lot
134 with a minimum of 3,000 square feet and 30 feet of frontage.

135 Ms. Bergeson mentioned that the applicant had submitted all required documents,
136 including the draft plat and civil plans. Staff had sent out one round of review comments,
137 and the applicant was working on addressing them. There were no major concerns with
138 the submitted plans.

139 Two outstanding items were highlighted:

- 140 ● A firewall separation was required when there was a property line running between
141 buildings.
- 142 ● A survey showed a covered patio extending too close to the rear property line,
143 which needed to be addressed.

144 The applicant had already submitted a building permit for the firewall separation and was
145 working with the building official to get the permit issued, make improvements, and have
146 them inspected and accepted. The building permit would also need to include changes to
147 modify the patio in order to meet zoning requirements.

148
149 Staff recommended approval of the subdivision plat amendment request with conditions,
150 including having the building permit issued and completed prior to final recording of the
151 plat.

152
153 Michael Williams, the property owner, was then invited to address the commission. He
154 confirmed that the covered patio would be removed, and the plans would be updated
155 accordingly. Mr. Williams mentioned he had owned the property for five years and had
156 seen several other nearby properties subdivided into twin homes. He expressed hope
157 that this application to do so would be approved as well.

158
159 In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Quigley, Mr. Williams confirmed he would
160 be occupying one side of the property. He thanked the commission for their consideration.

161
162 Chair Russell opened the public hearing, but no members of the public came forward to
163 speak, nor did anyone online express a desire to speak.

164
165 **MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to approve File #4S25-SUB-000525-2025,**
166 **along w/ the conditions of approval approving a Subdivision Plat**
167 **Amendment Allowing a Two-Family Lot Split for the Properties Located**
168 **at 4719 South and 4717 South Cathay Circle. The motion was seconded**
169 **by Commissioner Quigley and passed unanimously.**

170
171

5. Public Hearing and Consideration of Preliminary Subdivision Amendment to Create Four Residential Lots (and a Private Lane Exemption Request) on a 1.42 Acres of Property at 1280 West Marinwood Ave. in Taylorsville, Utah; File 3S25 – SUB-000519-2025; Terryne Bergeson, Planner

172
173
174
175
176

Terryne Bergeson presented the application for a preliminary subdivision amendment to create four residential lots and a private lane exemption request on 1.42 acres of property at 1280 West Marinwood Avenue in Taylorsville, Utah. The applicant was property owner George Halliday.

177
178
179

Ms. Bergeson explained that the property was a large undeveloped piece of land located off Marinwood Avenue. The parcel was zoned R-1-10, which allowed a single-family home on a lot with a minimum of 10,000 square feet.

180
181
182

She explained that in 2022, the Hallidays had applied for a subdivision to clean up lot lines and zoning. Now, they wished to split the large lot 103 to create four new lots for their family to build upon.

183
184
185
186

Ms. Bergeson mentioned that the applicants submitted a complete subdivision amendment application, including civil plans and a draft plat. The main issue was related to access. The applicants proposed a 42-foot-wide private road, but city code called for a 50-foot-wide public right-of-way.

187

The applicants were requesting exemptions for:

188
189
190

- Designating the street as private rather than public
- Allowing a 42-foot-wide right-of-way instead of one that was 50 feet
- A different type of curb (to be considered by the city engineer)

191
192
193
194

Ms. Bergeson explained the city's preference for a public road, citing concerns about future development, maintenance issues, and connectivity. She also mentioned that requiring a 50-foot-wide right-of-way could potentially reduce the developable area of some lots.

195
196
197

Commissioner Muñoz asked if requiring the 50-foot-wide road would result in the applicant having to settle for fewer lots. Ms. Bergeson responded that would likely be the result.

198
199
200
201

Commissioner Willardson asked Ms. Bergeson to address point no. 9 in the applicant's exhibit regarding sewer service. Ms. Bergeson indicated that the Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement engineer was not concerned and had explained that the proposed lots would be served by the sewer line off of Marinwood Ave.

202

203 Commissioner Wright was intrigued by point no. 6 of the exhibit—that this was a Planned
204 Development that should be treated the same as a Planned Development from a larger,
205 professional land developer who requested a private street

206 Ms. Bergeson thought perhaps she had used incorrect verbiage in her telephone
207 conversations with the applicant. Although a private street had been approved recently, it
208 was in a site-specific development (SSD) zone. Additionally, when she had mentioned
209 that the city received added benefit, she was referring to being able to negotiate higher
210 architectural standards which wasn't possible in this situation.

211 Commissioner Wright asked what Taylorsville would be losing if there were no 50-foot
212 public right of way. Ms. Bergeson responded that staff were open to the 42' street stub
213 but asked that it meet city standards as a public roadway. This was recommended due to
214 the possibility of future development nearby. Private roads seem like a great idea early
215 on, but years later when ownership has changed hands and/or property owners no longer
216 wish to maintain the road and they become the city's responsibility, they are problematic
217 because they weren't built to city standards.

218 George Halliday, the applicant, was invited to address the commission. He explained that
219 he was trying to provide homes for his family on the property. Halliday emphasized that
220 they had worked with the city over the years to reach this point and he felt that the project
221 would be a real benefit to the community.

222 Several of Halliday's sons, including Curtis, Isaac, and Samuel, also spoke to the
223 commission, expressing their desire to build homes and set down roots in the community.
224 They addressed concerns about future development, elevation changes, and the
225 character of the neighborhood.

226 Multiple neighbors, including Ruth McGowan, Rod Tye, and Jeff Wood, spoke in support
227 of Mr. Halliday's proposal, emphasizing the close-knit nature of the community and their
228 preference for single-family homes over potential future high-density development.

229 The commission engaged in extensive discussion about the merits of a public versus
230 private road, the width of the right-of-way, and potential future development scenarios.
231 They also considered the formation of an HOA to manage road maintenance and other
232 shared responsibilities.

233 Knowing that staff were comfortable with a 42' road, what was it that the applicant would
234 lose by having it be public and not private? Ms. Bergeson reiterated that the city's
235 construction standards were higher and that a stub street would be required to extend to
236 the far north property line, reducing the buildable area.

237

238 A member of the audience spoke but was reminded that the public comment period was
239 not yet open.

240

241 Chair Russell commented that he had not dealt much with private streets and wondered
242 about the pros and cons of them. Ms. Bergeson reiterated her concerns about the lower
243 standards to which they were typically built. She also mentioned one that she knew of
244 that had essentially left some land in the city undevelopable because there was no access
245 other than via a private road.

246
247 Mr. Spung pointed out that the only private roads that had been approved in the last
248 approximately ten years or so were associated with the aforementioned SSD zone. Any
249 other private lane would be for a flag lot. City code currently established a maximum of
250 two lots that could access a private lane, but this proposal would be for 3-4 to have access
251 to it. While a private street might facilitate the development of these lots now, it's quite
252 common for new property owners decades later to want to hand the road off to the city.
253 Historically that is what the city has seen happen. A public road extending to the north
254 property line would allow lots to the north to tie into the street and develop further. The
255 Hallidays owned all the property now, but in 50-100 years they might not; that's what the
256 city needed to keep in mind.

257
258
259 Commissioner Wright commented that the north portion of lot 4 could be adjusted into lot
260 3 and potentially allow for more square footage in lot 2.

261
262
263 Chair Russell invited the applicant to step forward and address the planning commission.
264 George Halliday did so, explaining that his three sons were the ones who would be living
265 on the new lots. He did not feel there was a need for a public road to extend to 4800
266 South. He also indicated that they had worked with city staff to the extent possible, but
267 every time further engineering work was required, he was left with the bill. He felt he had
268 "given in on everything" and that having his family there would be a benefit to the
269 community.

270
271 Commissioner Wilkey said it appeared he wasn't married to the idea of having a private
272 lane—just that it be 42' rather than 50'. Mr. Halliday responded that he was "dedicated to
273 this, right here, right now" meaning he did indeed want the project to move forward as he
274 now presented it, explaining that he had paid for engineering to first consider a cul-de-
275 sac that was not approved. He said a public road was "out of the question" as was having
276 it 50' wide.

277
278 Commissioner Wilkey pointed out that she happened to live on a private lane and would
279 *never* want to do it again. She saw the problems and lived the problems that came with
280 it. She suspected it was fine early on, but after the property changes hands a time or two,
281 people don't care if the road is maintained or if people park along both sides, making it
282 difficult to drive through.

283
284 Mr. Halliday responded that the property would be in the family long-term and that he
285 hoped to set up a trust so that there would be funds available when the road needed to

286 be re-paved for example. He had spoken with his sons, and they were all fine with it being
287 a private road and having to take care of it.

288
289 Commissioner Muñoz asked the applicant what his plans were if his application for
290 exemptions were to be denied. He responded that he was committed to this project and
291 that one of his sons had already been in touch with the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman
292 who indicated he would be “glad to take that case.” Mr. Halliday said he would prefer not
293 to do that as it would cost both sides money. He felt there had been a good working
294 relationship with the planning staff, but he was ready to move forward with the exception.

295
296 Commissioner Wright asked Mr. Halliday if he would be agreeable to a 42’ public drive
297 that did not extend all the way to the end. Although he initially answered in the affirmative,
298 he then said only if it did not take much “design change.”

299
300 Mr. Spung pointed out that one of the options staff had suggested was to allow the 42’
301 right-of-way as an exception but that it be public and terminate at the property line so that
302 it could then continue to the north. He indicated that one other important point to make
303 was that there were some financial implications regarding the private vs. public question.
304 If it were a public street, the city would record a bond for the public improvements and the
305 bond would cover the cost of all of the construction. Once the construction was completed
306 and inspected, 90% of the cost of the improvements/bond would be refunded, and after
307 one year and an additional inspection if everything was still in good shape, the remaining
308 10% would be refunded.

309
310 Commissioner Quigley said he wished to clarify what staff sought. Did the city *require* that
311 the road (whether 42’ or 50’) extended to the property line or was it simply a preference?
312 Mr. Spung responded that there would be no benefit to the city if it did not and the standard
313 in city code required that the street stub to the property line.

314
315 Chair Russell opened the public hearing.

316
317 Mr. Halliday's sons Curtis, Isaac, and Samuel spoke to the commission, expressing their
318 desire to build homes and set down roots in the community. They addressed concerns
319 about future development, elevation changes, and the character of the neighborhood.
320 Isaac Halliday said that according to the Property Ombudsman, as a private development
321 there was no obligation for it to benefit the city. He also indicated that he would be in favor
322 of the road being public only if it was built exactly as they had it drawn up.

323
324 Multiple neighbors, including Ruth McGowan, Rod Tye, and Jeff Wood, spoke in support
325 of Mr. Halliday's proposal, emphasizing the close-knit nature of the community and their
326 preference for single-family homes over potential future high-density development. Ms.
327 McGowan did not believe there was room for a new road.

328

329 Ms. Bergeson read four emailed comments into the record, three of which were in favor
330 of the Halliday application and one of which was not.

331
332 Chair Russell asked if there was anyone online wishing to speak. Staff responded in the
333 negative. The Chair invited the applicant to make any final comments which he did,
334 thanking his neighbors for their support. He reiterated his belief that the project as he
335 proposed it would fit well within the community and would be a benefit.

336
337 Chair Russell then closed the public hearing.

338
339 Commissioner Wright said he saw no reason to reject the proposal, but he wished to hear
340 Commissioner Wilkey's thoughts on addressing problems that were likely to occur in the
341 future.

342
343 Commissioner Wilkey thanked the applicant for building single-family homes. However,
344 she described the private lane in her neighborhood (smaller than 42' wide) as an "extreme
345 challenge" with property owners renting out different portions of their homes, each house
346 with multiple drivers who end up parking along that road making it difficult to pass through.
347 This resulted in a safety issue with drivers unable to see children playing in the area.
348 Additionally, an effort is made to collect funds from all the property owners when it's time
349 to maintain it, but some are unconcerned with the state of the roadway and were therefore
350 unwilling to pay their portion. She suspected that back in the day when there were only
351 4-5 property owners who were all related and all in agreement, it probably worked fine.
352 But in her neighborhood were that was no longer the case, fifteen of the twenty years she
353 had lived there were full of nothing but contention.

354
355 Commission Quigley felt the challenges she presented were unique to her neighborhood
356 and not necessarily likely to occur in this instance. He felt it came down to property rights
357 and what the city wanted to see for the future. But he felt the property rights should take
358 precedence. Moreover, there had been much discussion in recent years about young
359 families not being able to afford to purchase homes in our community. He also suggested
360 that parking on the road would be just as challenging if it were a public road. To deny this
361 application would be contrary to previously stated goals. He concluded his comments by
362 suggesting there was no reason to add a through-street in the neighborhood.

363
364 Mr. Spung pointed out that fire code would prohibit parking on the private road in order to
365 maintain access for emergency vehicles. However, the city would not enforce that
366 restriction because of the private status. It would be the responsibility of the property
367 owners.

368
369 Commissioner Muñoz had an experience where a road had not been maintained, and an
370 ambulance was unable to reach one of her family members. She wondered if city code
371 could mandate the maintenance to avoid such a problem here. Mr. Spung responded that
372 if such a thing were to happen in this situation, it would be the homeowners that were
373 liable and not the city.

374

375 Commissioner Wilkey wondered if there was a way to come to an agreement to build a
376 public road that did not extend to the property line. Mr. Spung responded that it could be
377 discussed with the engineering department. He suspected that if it did not terminate at
378 the property line, the engineer would require that it terminate with a cul-de-sac or other
379 finished turn around. At least that was the feedback from engineering thus far.

380
381 Commissioner McElreath stated that although some expressed concern about the fact
382 that so many people were focused on what would happen in the future, that was their
383 responsibility—they were the planning commission for a reason. He leaned in favor of it
384 being a public road. (Note: Due to a technical glitch with the Commissioner’s microphone,
385 not all of his comments were discernible upon playback.)

386
387 The applicant asked to speak again which Chair Russell allowed. Mr. Halliday indicated
388 this road would only service three lots. He stated they had looked at all the other options
389 and had brought plans forward three times. It was expensive, and any further votes
390 against him would continue to cost him more money.

391
392 Commissioner Wright explained that he had been seeking a non-binding admonition in
393 the event something unexpected took place. He suggested that a homeowner’s
394 association could make things clear for everyone involved, saying he would be in support
395 of making it a private drive.

396
397 Commissioner Quigley asked if there were plans to have an HOA agreement that would
398 be binding on the various property owners. Mr. Halliday responded that engineers had
399 said they could help set one up to plan for future maintenance needs.

400
401 Commissioner Quigley asked staff and his colleagues if they as a commission could
402 recommend that they do so. Commissioner Wilkey was doubtful, since it would be a
403 private road. Ms. Bergeson responded that it was required that there be a note placed on
404 the plat so that any future property owners would be aware of their obligations... Mr.
405 Spung explained that is what happens with an SSD zone—there are specific standards
406 that are negotiated in a development agreement. But for this type of non-SSD project, it
407 would be up to the property owners to create the HOA and manage it themselves if they
408 chose to do so. The city could not require it.

409
410 Mr. Halliday and Ms. Bergeson both commented that there were notes on the draft plat
411 referencing an HOA as well as ‘no parking’ signs along the proposed private road.

412
413 **MOTION: Commissioner McElreath moved to table File #3S25 / SUB-000519-2025**
414 **to give staff adequate time to work out the remaining conditions**
415 **including working on options for a 42’ right of way as a public street. The**
416 **motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkey**

417
418 **Commissioner McElreath Aye**
419 **Commissioner Quigley Nay**
420 **Commissioner Wilkey Aye**

421 **Commissioner Wright** **Nay**
422 **Chair Russell** **Nay**
423 **Commissioner Willardson** **Aye**
424 **Commissioner Muñoz** **Aye**

425
426 **Motion Passed 4-3**

427
428 **MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to adjourn. Chair Russell seconded the**
429 **motion which passed unanimously.**

430
431 The meeting adjourned at 8:17p.m.

432
433
434
435
436 _____
437 Jamie Brooks, City Recorder

438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447

DRAFT