

**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 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.

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

**GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 p.m.**

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

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

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

**Consent Agenda**

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

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

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

**Subdivisions (Administrative Action)**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>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</li></ol> |
|---|

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

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

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

Two outstanding items were highlighted:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 188       • Designating the street as private rather than public  
189       • Allowing a 42-foot-wide right-of-way instead of one that was 50 feet  
190       • 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Russell opened the public hearing.

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

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

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

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

Chair Russell then closed the public hearing.

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commissioner McElreath	Aye
Commissioner Quigley	Nay
Commissioner Wilkey	Aye
Commissioner Wright	Nay
Chair Russell	Nay
Commissioner Willardson	Aye
Commissioner Muñoz	Aye

**Motion Passed 4-3**

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:17p.m.

---

Jamie Brooks, City Recorder