

**City of Taylorsville  
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
October 28, 2025**

**Briefing – 6:00 p.m. / Regular Session – 6:30 p.m.  
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

## Attendance-

## Planning Commission

Don Russell - Chair  
Barbara Muñoz  
Don Quigley  
David Wright  
David Young -Alternate

## Community Development Staff

Dina Blaes - Strategic Engagement  
Terryne Bergeson - Planner  
Jamie Brooks – City Recorder  
Ryan Richards – Dep. City Attorney

**Excused:** Commissioners McElreath, Willardson and Wilkey

**Others Present:** Penny Fletcher, Casey Forbush, Mitchell Grimone, Sara Harding, Jean Hellstrom, Zane Latimer, David Matyjavić, Eric Warnick, and Norman Wendel

## **BRIEFING SESSION** – 6:00 P.M.

## 1. Briefing Session to Review Agenda

At 6:08 p.m., Chair Russell called the meeting to order and turned the time over to Terryne Bergeson who briefly reviewed the agenda.

Ms. Bergeson explained the application for a text amendment related to on-premises directional signs, initiated by Jimmy Nielsen with Intermountain Health (IHC) and Justin Grubb, their sign contractor. She then detailed three applications for one proposal at the Beltway West property: a general plan map amendment, a zoning map amendment from professional office to SSD residential zone, and a text amendment to adopt chapter 13.45 for the proposed SSD-R zoning district.

Chair Russell inquired whether items 7, 8, and 9 could be combined into a single presentation. Ms. Bergeson explained they would be presented together but would require separate motions. Staff recommended continuing all three items after receiving public comments, as this represented the first public review of this significant development proposal. Fifteen residents were inadvertently left off the initial public notice mailer. Staff had then personally delivered notices to these residents, and the items would be re-noticed for the next meeting for an additional public hearing.

Regarding Agenda Item #6, Commissioner Young asked what the proposed change entailed. Ms. Bergeson responded that currently an on-premises sign could not exceed 5 sq feet in total area including 4' in height. The proposal was to increase the maximum size to 16 sq ft up to 6' in height.

45

46 Commissioner Wright pointed out that on page 4 of the staff report there appeared to be  
47 a typo in 3.a.(3) where the proposed maximum was listed as "four (4) square foot area."

48 The briefing session adjourned at approximately 6:19 p.m.

49 **GENERAL MEETING** – 6:30 P.M.

50 Chair Russell opened the regular meeting at 6:31 p.m. and read the welcome statement.

51

52 **CONSENT AGENDA**

**2. Mark McGrath Retirement Announcement**

53 Long Range Planner Mark McGrath had spoken with the various Planning  
54 Commissioners prior to the regular meeting and then departed. Chief of Strategic  
55 Engagement Dina Blaes took a moment to publicly thank Mr. McGrath for his 25 years of  
56 service to Taylorsville City. He noted that many seasoned planners throughout Utah got  
57 their start in Taylorsville under Mark's mentorship, highlighting his significant impact on  
58 the professional planning community. Don mentioned Mark's "City in Literature" class  
59 taught jointly with Michael Malloy at the University of Utah, encouraging commissioners  
60 to audit the class for a deeper appreciation of planning principles. A celebration for Mark  
61 was scheduled for October 30th from noon to 2 PM in the council chambers.

62

**3. Training Follow Up: Distribution of *Parliamentary Procedure at a Glance***

63 Ms. Blaes presented each commissioner with a copy of "Parliamentary Procedure at a  
64 Glance" as a follow-up to Wilf Sommerkorn's previous training. She explained it was  
65 based on Robert's Rules of Order and would help ensure proper procedures during  
66 meetings, particularly during contentious discussions. While she joked about not having  
67 a book club, she emphasized it was a valuable resource for making motions and following  
68 parliamentary procedures.

69

70

**4. Report on the American Planning Association (Utah Chapter) Conference**

71 Chair Russell reported on the conference held at the Gateway in Salt Lake City, noting  
72 the unique venue that started as a nightclub space and moved to the movie theaters. He  
73 appreciated the comfortable seating and large screens for presentations. Sessions  
74 focused on future planning and youth-oriented planning initiatives.

75 Ms. Bergeson highlighted keynote speaker Mitchell Silver, a Raleigh, NC council member  
76 and former New York City Parks Commissioner. Silver emphasized implementing general

77 plans as dynamic living documents with annual evaluations by implementation teams. He  
78 discussed how zoning tools translated to actual experiences for residents and whether  
79 tools were fixing intended problems. Ms. Bergeson also attended a session that saw trees  
80 as infrastructure and took a walking tour of five historic buildings converted to multifamily  
81 housing, demonstrating Salt Lake City's approach to increasing housing supply while  
82 preserving neighborhood character.

**5. Review and Approval of the minutes from the meetings held on July 22  
and August 26, 2025**

83  
84 **MOTION:** Commissioner Wright moved to approve the minutes of July 22, 2025 as  
85 presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Muñoz and  
86 passed unanimously.

87  
88 **Motion Passed: 5-0**

89  
90 Commissioner Quigley mentioned that because he was not present on August 26, he  
91 would abstain from the vote approving that particular set of minutes.

92  
93 **MOTION:** Commissioner Wright moved to approve the minutes of the August 26,  
94 2025 meeting. The motion was seconded by Chair Russell and passed  
95 unanimously by Commissioners Muñoz, Wright, Young, and Chair  
96 Russell.

97  
98 **Motion Passed: 4-0**

**ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT – LEGISLATIVE ACTION**

**6. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Development  
Code Text Amendment to Section 13.26.090(A)(3) Related to On-Premises  
Directional Signs (File 5Z25-DCA-000549-2025 / Applicant: Jimmy Nielsen,  
IHC & Justin Grubb, Trademark Visual / Location: 5770 South 1500 West /  
Presenter: Terryne Bergeson)**

101 Ms. Bergeson presented the text amendment application initiated by Intermountain Health  
102 (IHC) and their sign contractor after their directional signs for the new children's  
103 behavioral health unit were deemed non-compliant with current city standards. The facility  
104 needed larger directional signs to guide visitors to different entrances including  
105 ambulance emergency sections and day treatment programs.

106 Current standards allowed on-premises directional signs of no more than 5 square feet in  
107 area and maximum heights of 3 feet within sight triangles or 4 feet outside of the sight  
108 triangle. The proposed amendment would increase the allowed area to 16 square feet

109 and height to 6 feet, while limiting business name or logo area to 4 square feet to prevent  
110 signs from becoming additional advertising.

111 Ms. Bergeson showed examples of recently approved signs under current standards,  
112 demonstrating their small size and limited visibility from the street. The proposed changes  
113 would allow more flexibility in sign dimensions while maintaining the directional purpose,  
114 and staff recommended approval of the proposed ordinance.

115  
116 Commissioner Wright alluded to comments Commissioner Quigley had made at a  
117 previous meeting regarding the reasons the current sign ordinance was approved and  
118 although he had no specific objection to the proposed change, he wondered about  
119 possible unintended consequences. He asked what would compel a business like  
120 America First Credit Union, for example, to decide to install larger signs following this  
121 change.

122  
123 Ms. Bergeson pointed out that there was a limitation as to how much area could be  
124 devoted to a business name or logo. Additionally, there was a proximity limit. That is, two  
125 such signs could not be placed within fewer than 25' from one another.

126 Commissioner Quigley raised concerns about sight triangle safety, particularly in interior  
127 parking lots where the current standards only applied to street corners. He worried that  
128 6-foot signs on parking islands could create traffic hazards and obstruct views of  
129 pedestrians.

130 Commissioner Wright wondered where the sight triangle would be measured from. Ms.  
131 Blaes pointed out that Taylorsville Municipal Code 13.26.050 stated that "*no sign more*  
132 *than thirty inches (30") in height (above the top back of curb) shall be erected near any*  
133 *driveway or intersection for vehicular traffic within a triangular area formed by the*  
134 *intersection of straight lines extended from the back of curb (or a future curb) and a line*  
135 *connecting them at points sixty feet (60') from the intersection of the lines. Deviations*  
136 *from these requirements must be reviewed and approved by the city engineer.*"

137 Commissioner Quigley pointed out that sight triangles had nothing to do with interior  
138 parking lots, and Commissioner Wright wondered if language could be added to apply  
139 sight triangle restrictions to interior parking areas—with the city engineer able to review  
140 if appropriate.

141 In response to a question from Commissioner Young, Ms. Bergeson clarified that the  
142 proposed change was only relevant to a single type of sign—on-premises directional  
143 signage.

144 Chair Russell invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission and Zane Latimer  
145 with Trademark Visual introduced himself. When Commissioner Muñoz asked how the  
146 size requirements compared to those in other cities he worked in, he responded that he  
147 had not run into issues and had been able to erect 5' tall signage in a variety of

148 municipalities without violating their sign codes. He confirmed they worked to ensure  
149 signs did not impede traffic visibility and could adjust placement as needed.

150 Chair Russell opened the public hearing. However, there was no one either in person or  
151 online who expressed a desire to speak, so the Chair closed the public hearing.

152  
153 **MOTION: Commissioner Quigley moved to send a positive recommendation to the**  
154 **City Council for File #5Z25-DCA-000549-2025 to amend the Taylorsville**  
155 **Municipal Code related to on-premises signs, as specified in Exhibit A of**  
156 **the staff report based on the findings outlined in the report with the**  
157 **addition that any signage located in an interior parking lot impacted by**  
158 **traffic must follow the same standards as the line of sight, clear-vision**  
159 **triangle, subject to review by the city engineer.** The motion was seconded  
160 **by Commissioner Young and passed unanimously.**

161

162

163

### **GENERAL PLAN MAP AMENDMENT – LEGISLATIVE ACTION**

7. **Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a General Plan map Amendment for Approximately 13.248 Acres of Property at 4271 S, 4225 S, and 4273 S 2700 West from Employment Center & Employment Mix to Residential-High Intensity; (File 1GP25-GPLAN-000551-2025 / Applicant: DAI Utah (Motion Townhomes), Chase Andrizzi and Casey Forbush / Presenter: Terryne Bergeson)**

8. **Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Map Amendment for Approximately 13.248 Acres of Property at 4271 S, 4225 S, and 4273 S 2700 W from Professional Office (PO) to Site-Specific Development Residential (SSD-R) (File #6Z25-DCA-000553-2025 / Applicant: DAI Utah (Motion Townhomes), Chase Andrizzi and Casey Forbush / Presenter: Terryne Bergeson)**

9. **Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Text Amendment to Taylorsville Municipal Code Adopting Chapter 13.45 Standards for the SSD-R Motion Zoning District (File #7Z25-DCA-000553-2025 / Applicant: DAI Utah (Motion Townhomes), Chase Andrizzi and Casey Forbush / Location: 4271 S, 4225 S, and 4273 S 2700 W / Presenter: Terryne Bergeson)**

164 Ms. Bergeson presented all three related applications together for the Beltway West  
165 property, consisting of 13.248 acres of undeveloped land. The property currently had two  
166 completed office buildings seeking tenants, with three parcels approved in 2021 for office  
167 use but which remained undeveloped. The applicants, Casey Forbush and Chase  
168 Andrizzi with DAI Utah, sought to change the general plan designation from employment

169 uses to residential high intensity, rezone from professional office to SSD-R, and adopt  
170 new zoning standards for the development.

171 The proposal included 221 townhome units on approximately 13 acres, ranging from 2-3  
172 stories with density just under 17 dwelling units per acre. This aligned with the residential  
173 high intensity place type (3-6 story buildings with 15-40 units per acre) in the recently  
174 adopted general plan. Ms. Bergeson noted the R-1-5 zoning to the north allowed  
175 approximately 8.7 units per acre.

176 The concept plan showed front setbacks ranging from 10-20 feet from public streets, side  
177 setbacks of 22-27 feet between buildings, and rear setbacks of 15-20 feet. Buffers from  
178 existing residential to the north ranged from 22-58 feet, with a 35-foot buffer at the  
179 northeast corner. The eastern setback from commercial parking was 15 feet.

180 Street design included a 67-foot right-of-way at the entrance from 2700 West, narrowing  
181 to 52 feet internally. The design featured 28 feet of pavement throughout, 9-foot parallel  
182 parking areas, and sidewalks that tapered from 8 feet to 5 feet. All driveways fronting  
183 public streets were proposed at 20 feet to prevent vehicles from overhanging onto  
184 sidewalks.

185 The development exceeded minimum parking requirements with 684 total spaces (3.1  
186 per unit), including 0.62 guest spaces per unit compared to the required 0.25. Proposed  
187 amenities included a clubhouse with fitness center, pool with deck jets, hot tub, fire pit,  
188 playground, and dog park. The project provided 38.19% open space, well above the  
189 required 15%.

190 Commissioners Quigley and Wright questioned why the property was being changed from  
191 business park to residential. Ms. Blaes explained that the suburban office market could  
192 not support commercial development there, with vacancies at 17% in Taylorsville. She  
193 referenced the August 6 City Council meeting where market constraints were discussed  
194 as well as the pressure from Governor Cox for cities to produce more housing. The  
195 Council had directed staff to pursue options that were right for Taylorsville's trajectory  
196 while maintaining high quality standards.

197 Chair Russell invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

198 Joe Salisbury of DAI Utah presented additional information about Motion Townhomes.  
199 DAI had developed master-planned communities for 25 years, producing 17-20% of  
200 residential lots statewide. Their rental townhome product targeted "renters by choice,"  
201 offering high-end amenities including daily trash service, lawn care, snow removal, and  
202 on-site management and maintenance.

203 Mr. Salisbury detailed three anticipated housing types: 2-story stacked units with 1-  
204 bedroom units below and 2-bedroom above; 3-story traditional townhomes with 2-3  
205 bedrooms; and "FlexGen" units with adjoining doors between floors for multigenerational

206 living. Rental rates would range from \$1,400-1,500 for 1-bedrooms to \$2,300-2,600 for 3-  
207 bedrooms. Mr. Salisbury noted that mortgages were currently 40% higher than was rent.

208 The developer committed to building infrastructure for future condominium conversion on  
209 60% of units, offered 20% rent reduction for two police officers ongoing, and agreed to  
210 phase construction with the eastern portion first to buffer existing neighbors from  
211 construction impacts.

212 Commissioner Wright asked what would happen to the existing business on site. Ms.  
213 Blaes responded that the existing property owner would retain it, but currently only one  
214 of the business units was occupied by a tenant.

215  
216 Commissioner Muñoz asked if any of the three-story units were adjacent to any single-  
217 family homes. Mr. Salisbury responded, "Just along there" and the location was unclear  
218 on the audio tape. In response to a question from Commissioner Young, Mr. Salisbury  
219 pointed out that there was a 35' setback between the property line and the three-story  
220 units. That was part of an agreement created with the HOA.  
221 Chair Russell opened the public hearing.

222 Penny Fletcher from Village 2 expressed concern about opening the locked gate at Dutch  
223 Draw Drive for secondary access, noting their subdivision had only one entrance/exit.  
224 She questioned the high density compared to surrounding areas and anticipated parking  
225 problems.

226 Norm Wendel, a Village 2 resident since 1973, raised concerns about drainage issues on  
227 Solitude Ridge. He also worried about over 500 additional cars daily, insufficient parking  
228 for potential 4-car households, and building roads over the North Jordan Canal given the  
229 nearby earthquake fault.

230 Eric Warnick was opposed to the rezone as being too dense, although he was supportive  
231 of residential development there. He cited existing traffic problems on 2700 West and  
232 noted units on the northeast corner had no driveways or nearby parking, likely pushing  
233 overflow to neighboring streets. He calculated actual free parking at 0.33-0.45 spaces per  
234 unit when excluding private driveways.

235 Mitch Grimone requested denial of the rezoning to protect existing families, emphasizing  
236 concerns about opening the Dutch Draw gate and the development's impact on safety,  
237 traffic, and neighborhood character.

238 Ms. Bergeson read a written comment into the record which had been submitted by Sara  
239 Harding opposing the rezoning, citing unfair impacts to Village 2 from opening their gate  
240 for secondary access, concerns about 3-story townhomes behind single-family homes  
241 affecting privacy and property values, and frustration that existing homeowners would  
242 bear negative impacts from the developer's shift from failed commercial to residential use.

243 There was no one else who expressed a desire to speak, so Chair Russell closed the  
244 public hearing.

245 Commissioner Quigley thanked Ms. Blaes for explaining the general plan change  
246 rationale but emphasized doing development correctly. He noted Taylorsville's bedroom  
247 community status and need to give people reasons to both live and play here. He  
248 suggested more family-friendly open spaces beyond pools, including splash pads, on-site  
249 childcare, and seating areas throughout. He emphasized that while Taylorsville needed  
250 housing, it shouldn't abandon the general plan for the first attractive proposal without  
251 ensuring it would be a quality development. He shared the concerns regarding increased  
252 traffic and ingress/egress.

253 Commissioner Young asked if the Homeowner's Association owned Dutch Draw or if it  
254 was owned and maintained by the city. Ms. Bergeson responded that it was a public road  
255 connecting into a public stub street. In fact, there were three different public stub streets  
256 in that subdivision.

257 Ms. Blaes wished to point out that city subdivision standards required at least two points  
258 of ingress and egress. That wasn't required when it was expected that the property would  
259 be commercial, but now that it would be residential, at least one additional access point  
260 was necessary. This was primarily in order to meet fire code, and Village 2 currently only  
261 had one access point which could be problematic in the event of an emergency. She  
262 stated it was not a requirement of Salt Lake County when the area was initially developed  
263 but pointed out the importance of following current safety standards. She acknowledged  
264 the frustration of those living in Village 2 and conceded that some long conversations  
265 would need to take place between the HOA board and those residents. She felt the  
266 drainage issues were critical to the discussion and she anticipated the applicant returning  
267 to the November 18<sup>th</sup> planning commission meeting with more technical information on  
268 that topic.

269 Commissioner Young asked if drainage was the city's responsibility. Ms. Blaes responded  
270 that landowners were responsible for drainage of storm water off of their land-- a standard  
271 that every land developer was required to address. She anticipated working with the city  
272 engineer to ensure that development would not be too onerous on either the HOA or the  
273 applicant.

274 Commissioner Young asked the applicant about parking availability at a specific area on  
275 the map that he had provided. Mr. Salisbury pointed out that there was parallel parking in  
276 that area.

277 Commissioner Wright raised multiple technical concerns including:

278     • Drainage responsibilities for both the development and existing Village 2  
279     • Canal access, road impacts and maintenance  
280     • The public road status of Dutch Draw Drive  
281     • Parking adequacy for units without driveways on the northeast corner

282        • The lack of significant vegetation serving as a buffer between the commercial  
283        and residential areas

284        He expressed concern about the lack of "sense of place," noting the development felt like  
285        units had been pushed together without a meaningful arrival experience.

286        As commissioners discussed potential traffic impacts, Ms. Blaes indicated that a traffic  
287        study had been conducted by St. John properties when commercial development was  
288        anticipated and that could be provided at the next meeting. She also requested clarity  
289        regarding phrases such as "sense of place" and "placemaking." Commissioner Wright  
290        pointed out the apartments to the south of the subject property and the fact that they did  
291        not align well with what was proposed. He indicated it felt like things were just being  
292        "packed in."

293        **MOTION:** Commissioner Muñoz moved to continue file numbers 1GP25, 6Z25, and  
294        7Z25 to the November 18, 2025 Planning Commission meeting for the  
295        following specific reasons: for staff and the developer to return to the  
296        Planning Commission addressing the traffic study, to address the  
297        concerns regarding drainage in the SSD, and potential increased green  
298        space. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Quigley and passed  
299        unanimously.

300        **OTHER MATTERS**

301        **CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSIONS**

302        October 15, 2025

304        The October 15<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting was not discussed. Commissioner Quigley agreed  
305        to attend the November 5<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting and report back at the next Planning  
306        Commission meeting.

307        **ADJOURNMENT**

311        **MOTION:** Commissioner Quigley moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by  
312        Commissioner Muñoz and Chair Russell declared the meeting  
313        adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

---

314  
315  
316  
317        Jamie Brooks, MMC  
318        City Recorder  
319