

**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

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 Plotnow, Steve Plotnow, 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)**

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

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 Cathay Circle in Taylorsville, Utah. The applicant was Bill Weston Beltran on behalf of the property owner, Michael Williams, who was present at the meeting.

**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**

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.

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.

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.

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.

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)

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.

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.

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.

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

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