

**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.

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

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

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

2. Briefing Session to Review the Agenda – *Terryne Bergeson*

43 Planner Terryne Bergeson provided a brief overview of File 4S25, displaying an aerial
44 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 it 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 **GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 p.m.**

95

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

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 1.42 Acres of Property at 1280 West Marinwood Ave. in Taylorsville, Utah; File 3S25 – SUB-000519-2025; Terryne Bergeson, Planner

172
173 Terryne Bergeson presented the application for a preliminary subdivision amendment to
174 create four residential lots and a private lane exemption request on 1.42 acres of property
175 at 1280 West Marinwood Avenue in Taylorsville, Utah. The applicant was property owner
176 George Halliday.

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

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

183 Ms. Bergeson mentioned that the applicants submitted a complete subdivision
184 amendment application, including civil plans and a draft plat. The main issue was related
185 to access. The applicants proposed a 42-foot-wide private road, but city code called for a
186 50-foot-wide public right-of-way.

187 The applicants were requesting exemptions for:

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

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

198 Commissioner Willardson asked Ms. Bergeson to address point no. 9 in the applicant's
199 exhibit regarding sewer service. Ms. Bergeson indicated that the Taylorsville-Bennion
200 Improvement engineer was not concerned and had explained that the proposed lots
201 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 Knowing that staff were comfortable with a 42' road, what was it that the applicant would
219 lose by having it be public and not private? Ms. Bergeson reiterated that the city's
220 construction standards were higher and that a stub street would be required to extend to
221 the far north property line, reducing the buildable area.

222

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

225

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

231

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

242

243

244 Commissioner Wright commented that the north portion of lot 4 could be adjusted into lot
245 3 and potentially allow for more square footage in lot 2.

246

247

248 Chair Russell invited the applicant to step forward and address the planning commission.
249 George Halliday did so, explaining that his three sons were the ones who would be living
250 on the new lots. He did not feel there was a need for a public road to extend to 4800
251 South. He also indicated that they had worked with city staff to the extent possible, but
252 every time further engineering work was required, it cost him more money. He felt he had
253 "given in on everything" and that having his family there would be a benefit to the
254 community.

255

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

262

263 Commissioner Wilkey pointed out that she happened to live on a private lane and would
264 never want to do it again. She saw the problems that came with it. She suspected it had
265 been fine early on, but after the property changes hands a time or two, people tend not
266 to care if the road is maintained or if people park along both sides, making it difficult to
267 drive on the road.

268

269 Mr. Halliday responded that the property would be in the family long-term and that he
270 hoped to set up a trust so that there would be funds available when the road needed to
271 be re-paved for example. He had spoken with his sons, and they were all fine with it being
272 a private road and having to take care of it.

273

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

280

281 Commissioner Wright asked Mr. Halliday if he would be agreeable to a 42' public drive
282 that did not extend all the way to the end. Although he initially answered in the affirmative,
283 he then said only if it did not take much "design change."

284

285 Mr. Spung pointed out that one of the options staff had suggested was to allow the 42'
286 right-of-way as an exception but that it be public and terminate at the property line so that
287 it could then continue to the north. He indicated that one other important point to make
288 was that there were some financial implications regarding the private vs. public question.
289 If it were a public street, the city would record a bond for the public improvements and the

290 bond would cover the cost of all of the construction. Once the construction was completed
291 and inspected, 90% of the cost of the improvements/bond would be refunded, and after
292 one year and an additional inspection if everything was still in good shape, the remaining
293 10% would be refunded.

294

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

299

300 Chair Russell opened the public hearing.

301

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

308

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

313

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

316

317 Chair Russell asked if there was anyone online wishing to speak. Staff responded in the
318 negative. The Chair invited the applicant to make any final comments. He thanked his
319 neighbors for their support, reiterating his belief that the project as he proposed it would
320 fit well within the community and would be a benefit.

321

322 Chair Russell then closed the public hearing.

323 .

324 The commission engaged in extensive discussion about the merits of a public versus
325 private road, the width of the right-of-way, and potential future development scenarios.
326 They also considered the formation of an HOA to manage road maintenance and other
327 shared responsibilities. Commissioner Wright said he saw no reason to reject the
328 proposal, but he wished to hear Commissioner Wilkey's thoughts on addressing problems
329 that were likely to occur in the future.

330

331 Commissioner Wilkey thanked the applicant for building single-family homes. However,
332 she described the private lane in her neighborhood (admittedly smaller than 42' wide) as

333 an “extreme challenge” with property owners renting out different portions of their homes,
334 each house with multiple drivers who end up parking along that road making it difficult to
335 pass through. This resulted in a safety issue with drivers unable to see children playing
336 in the area. Additionally, an effort was made to collect funds from all the property owners
337 when it’s time to maintain it, but some are unconcerned with the state of the roadway and
338 were therefore unwilling to pay their portion. She suspected that back in the day when
339 there were only 4-5 property owners who were all related and all in agreement, it probably
340 worked fine. But in her neighborhood where that was no longer the case, fifteen of the
341 twenty years she had lived there were full of nothing but contention.

342
343 Commissioner Quigley suggested the challenges she presented were unique to her
344 neighborhood and not necessarily likely to occur in this instance. He felt it came down to
345 property rights and what the city wanted to see for the future. But he felt the property
346 rights should take precedence. Moreover, there had been much discussion in recent
347 years about young families not being able to afford to purchase homes in our community.
348 He also suggested that parking on the road would be just as challenging if it were a public
349 road. To deny this application would be contrary to the city’s previously stated goals. He
350 concluded his comments by suggesting there was no reason to add a through-street in
351 the neighborhood.

352
353 Mr. Spung pointed out that fire code would prohibit parking on the private road in order to
354 maintain access for emergency vehicles. However, the city would not enforce that
355 restriction because of the private status. It would be the responsibility of the property
356 owners.

357
358 Commissioner Muñoz had an experience where a road had not been maintained, and an
359 ambulance was unable to reach one of her family members. She wondered if city code
360 could mandate the maintenance to avoid such a problem here. Mr. Spung responded that
361 if such a thing were to happen in this situation, it would be the homeowners that were
362 liable and not the city.

363
364 Commissioner Wilkey wondered if there was a way to come to an agreement to build a
365 public road that did not extend to the property line. Mr. Spung responded that it could be
366 discussed with the engineering department. He suspected that if it did not terminate at
367 the property line, the engineer would require that it terminate with a cul-de-sac or other
368 finished turn around. At least that was the feedback from the city engineer thus far.

369
370 Commissioner McElreath stated that although some expressed concern about the fact
371 that so many people were focused on what might happen in the future, that was their
372 responsibility—they were the *planning* commission for a reason. He leaned in favor of it
373 being a public road. (Note: Due to a technical glitch with the Commissioner’s microphone,
374 not all of his comments were discernible upon playback.)

375
376 The applicant asked to speak again which Chair Russell allowed. Mr. Halliday indicated
377 this road would only service three lots. He stated they had looked at all the other options

378 and had brought plans forward three times. It was expensive, and any further votes
379 against him would continue to cost him more money.

380
381 Commissioner Wright explained that he had been seeking a non-binding admonition in
382 the event something unexpected took place. He suggested that a homeowner's
383 association could make things clear for everyone involved, saying he would be in support
384 of making it a private drive.

385
386 Commissioner Quigley asked if there were plans to have an HOA agreement that would
387 be binding on the various property owners. Mr. Halliday responded that engineers had
388 said they could help set one up to plan for future maintenance needs.

389
390 Commissioner Quigley asked staff and his colleagues if they as a commission could
391 recommend that they do so. Commissioner Wilkey was doubtful, since it would be a
392 private road. Ms. Bergeson responded that it was required that there be a note placed on
393 the plat so that any future property owners would be aware of their obligations. Mr. Spung
394 explained that is what happens with an SSD zone—there are specific standards that are
395 negotiated in a development agreement. But for this type of non-SSD project, it would be
396 up to the property owners to create the HOA and manage it themselves if they chose to
397 do so. The city could not require it.

398
399 Mr. Halliday and Ms. Bergeson both commented that there were notes on the draft plat
400 referencing an HOA as well as 'no parking' signs along the proposed private road.

401
402 **MOTION: Commissioner McElreath moved to table File #3S25 / SUB-000519-2025**
403 **to give staff adequate time to work out the remaining conditions**
404 **including working on options for a 42' right of way as a public street. The**
405 **motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkey**

406
407 **Commissioner McElreath Aye**
408 **Commissioner Quigley Nay**
409 **Commissioner Wilkey Aye**
410 **Commissioner Wright Nay**
411 **Chair Russell Nay**
412 **Commissioner Willardson Aye**
413 **Commissioner Muñoz Aye**

414
415 **Motion Passed 4-3**

416
417 **MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to adjourn. Chair Russell seconded the**
418 **motion which passed unanimously.**

419
420 The meeting adjourned at 8:17p.m.

421

422

423

Jamie Brooks, City Recorder