

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  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**City of Taylorsville**  
**Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**March 24, 2026**  
**Briefing – 6pm / Regular Session – 6:30 pm**  
**2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

---

**Attendance-**

**Planning Commission**

David Young, Chair  
Barbara Muñoz, Vice Chair  
Marc McElreath (Remote)  
B. Murphy (Alternate)  
Cindy Wilkey (Remote)  
Gordon Willardson  
David Wright

**Staff**

Grant Allen, Senior Planner  
Terryne Bergeson, Planner  
Dina Blaes, Strategic Engagement  
Jamie Brooks, City Recorder

**Excused:** Commissioner Don Russell

**Others Present:** Ernest Burgess

**BRIEFING SESSION – 6PM**

**1. Summary: Attached & Detached Accessory Dwelling Units – Grant Allen**

Senior Planner Grant Allen provided a comprehensive briefing on accessory dwelling units (ADUs), both internal and detached, focusing on recent legislative changes at the state level and their implications for Taylorsville. He emphasized this was an introductory discussion with more detailed conversations to follow, rather than an exhaustive treatment of the topic.

Mr. Allen explained that Taylorsville currently allowed internal ADUs, which included basement apartments and attached units such as additions to existing homes. The focus of the evening's discussion was on detached ADUs, which were separate structures from the main single-family dwelling.

The presentation centered on Senate Bill 284 from the 2026 legislative session, which mandated that municipalities adopt land use regulations permitting detached ADUs on lots of 11,000 square feet or larger containing single-family dwellings. Staff noted that while 11,000 square feet was the legislative minimum, cities could choose to allow detached ADUs on smaller lots.

Mr. Allen outlined the legislative requirements in two categories: mandatory actions (the city “shall”) and prohibited restrictions (the city “may not”). Under the mandatory requirements, the city must allow detached ADUs on qualifying lots, require compliance with building, health, and fire codes, and provide a process for converting existing legal accessory structures to detached ADUs.

50 Commissioner Murphy asked about the conversion process, specifically whether property  
51 owners would need to return to the city for approval. Mr. Allen confirmed that it would be  
52 necessary and explained that the specific process would be developed through future  
53 discussions, noting that utility connection requirements would likely significantly impact  
54 these changes.

55  
56 Regarding restrictions the city was prohibited from imposing, he explained that municipalities  
57 could not require more than one off-street parking space for units smaller than 650 square  
58 feet, could not require two off-street parking spaces for units larger than 650 square feet,  
59 and could not require design standards in the traditional sense.

60  
61 Commissioner Wright expressed concern about potential quality issues, questioning  
62 whether substandard structures could be built without design oversight. Mr. Allen  
63 addressed this by explaining the permitted regulations (things the city 'may' do),  
64 including the ability to require design consistency with single-family dwellings, though he  
65 acknowledged some ambiguity in the legislation prohibiting design standards while  
66 allowing design consistency requirements.

67  
68 Commissioner Muñoz raised similar concerns about the apparent contradiction  
69 between prohibiting design standards while permitting design consistency requirements,  
70 suggesting the legislation might need clarification in future legislative sessions. Staff  
71 acknowledged this ambiguity and referenced specific statutory language that would  
72 need further analysis.

73  
74 The discussion covered various regulatory options available to the city, including  
75 restrictions on structure size, dimensions, height, and lot coverage. Mr. Allen explained  
76 that maximum lot coverage regulations could control how much of a rear yard could  
77 be occupied by structures. Setback requirements from property lines, other structures,  
78 and easements were also discussed as permissible regulations.

79  
80 Commissioner Murphy inquired about the identification of utility easements, and Mr.  
81 Allen explained these were typically shown on subdivision plats or recorded separately  
82 for older properties predating subdivisions. The city could prohibit ADUs in public utility  
83 easements to protect both property owners and utilities from potential damage.

84  
85 He outlined additional regulatory options, including prohibiting units larger than the main  
86 dwelling, restricting front yard placement, prohibiting short-term rentals (less than 90 days),  
87 requiring owner occupancy, and limiting properties to one accessory dwelling unit, though  
88 he noted the city could choose to allow multiple units on larger parcels.

89  
90 A significant discussion point involved utility capacity constraints. Mr. Allen explained that  
91 if utility providers like Taylorsville Bennion Improvement District determined that  
92 additional units would require system improvements such as lift station upgrades, the city  
93 could prohibit ADUs in those specific areas.

94  
95 Commissioner Wright requested that future discussions include input from the  
96 improvement district, noting earlier mentioned reservations about potential impacts. Mr.  
97 Allen agreed to include utility providers in upcoming conversations.

98

99 He presented preliminary data showing Taylorsville had approximately 2,050 existing  
100 lots of 11,000 square feet or larger that would qualify under the legislative mandate. If the  
101 threshold were lowered to 10,000 square feet, the number increased to approximately 3,819  
102 lots. At 8,000 square feet, which would align with existing R-1-8 zoning, the count jumped  
103 dramatically to 8,289 lots, significantly expanding the potential impact across city  
104 neighborhoods.

105  
106 Staff concluded by indicating plans for future work sessions using a collaborative  
107 format, potentially including maps and draft standards for detailed discussion. They  
108 committed to researching approaches taken by other communities that had  
109 implemented detached ADU regulations for an extended period, learning from both  
110 successful implementations and necessary adjustments.

111  
112 The new legislation would take effect in the first week of May. Future discussions could  
113 proceed according to the Commission's preferences, whether focusing first on lot size  
114 thresholds or other regulatory aspects.

115  
116 The briefing session adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

117  
118 **GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 PM**

119  
120 Chair Young called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. at which time he read a statement  
121 explaining the role of the planning commission.

122  
123 **Consent Agenda:**

124  
125 **2. Approve Minutes from the February 24, 2026 and March 10, 2026  
Planning Commission Meetings.**

126  
127 **MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to approve the minutes from both February**  
128 **24 and March 10, 2026 as presented. The motion was seconded by**  
129 **Commissioner Willardson and passed unanimously.**

130  
131 **Main Agenda:**

132  
133 **3. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Nonadministrative Conditional  
Use Permit for Extended Hours of Operation and to Operate a Bar  
Establishment at 5418 South 1900 West – Terryne Bergeson**

134  
135 Ms. Bergeson explained that this was a continuation of the March 10th meeting. The  
136 application sought approval for a bar establishment and extended hours of operation at  
137 5418 South 1900 West, submitted by Jessica Blakeman on behalf of The Break Sports  
138 Bar and Grill.

139  
140 Ms. Bergeson detailed that the property was designated as high intensity commercial  
141 within the CenterPoint site-specific planning area and was zoned regional commercial.  
142 Since the location was within 250 feet of a residential zone, a nonadministrative  
conditional use permit was required for both the bar establishment and operation past 10

143 PM.

144

145 The property consisted of approximately 0.85 acres with a 7,300 square foot building. Ms.  
146 Bergeson noted that no significant changes to the site were proposed, except for slightly  
147 larger windows. The main entrance and exit would be on the south side, with a patio to  
148 the north that would serve only as a fire exit.

149

150 Ms. Bergeson explained the role of the Planning Commission in evaluating potential  
151 detrimental impacts and establishing appropriate conditions. The primary concern  
152 identified was the potential impact on peace and quiet of surrounding residential areas. A  
153 public notice had been mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the property on  
154 February 27, 2026, and notice was posted to the city and state websites on March 13,  
155 2026.

156

157 Regarding hours of operation, Ms. Bergeson clarified that while the staff report contained  
158 conditions for reduced weeknight hours, the applicant later requested reconsideration for  
159 extended hours. The original request was for operation until 1 AM all nights, with the  
160 Department of Alcoholic Beverage Services (DABS) requiring establishments to remain  
161 open one hour after last call. They would be willing to compromise to stay open until 1  
162 AM on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights.

163

164 Ms. Bergeson presented the following recommended conditions of approval, which had  
165 been updated from the March 10th meeting:

- 166 1. Existing patio feature may be used only after approval of a building permit that  
167 included the installation of sound mitigating features.
- 168 2. While expansion would require nonadministrative site plan review and approval,  
169 future expansion of outdoor patio and dining area was limited to eastward  
170 expansion of the existing patio, or on the east side of the site.
- 171 3. Outdoor patio or dining space would not be permitted on the south and west  
172 portions of the site, to mitigate impacts to the peace and comfort of adjacent  
173 residential.
- 174 4. Waste pickup was to occur no fewer than four times per week.
- 175 5. Hours of Operation to be determined in the motion.
- 176 6. Language to discourage loitering was to be printed on signage within the parking  
177 lot
- 178 7. In addition to state and federal laws, smoking and vaping could only occur on the  
179 east side of the building. Signs indicating such were to be posted on the building  
180 in a visible location.
- 181 8. An administrative review would take place six months after final approval to ensure  
182 compliance with the approved conditions to determine if the identified impacts were  
183 being mitigated. The Director could decide that the findings of the review needed  
184 to be presented to the planning commission to consider modifying or adding  
185 conditions.

186

187 Chair Young opened the public hearing. However, there were no members of the public  
188 either in person or online who expressed a desire to speak. The Chair then closed the  
189 public hearing.

190

191 Commissioner McElreath asked Ms. Bergeson to review the proposed hours of operation.  
192 She reiterated that since the staff report was created, the applicant had requested to

193 either be allowed to serve until 1 AM every day (closing at 2 AM) or keeping those hours  
194 at least on Thursday through Saturday. Commissioner McElreath was comfortable with  
195 either option since both were within DABS guidelines, knowing there would be a six-  
196 month review where hours could be adjusted if they proved to be problematic for the  
197 neighbors.

198  
199 Commissioner Wright asked what hours of operation were approved for reception centers  
200 in the city. Ms. Bergeson explained that reception centers typically were required to shut  
201 down by 10 PM Sunday through Thursday and operated until midnight on Friday and  
202 Saturday nights. She noted that the city had been requiring reception centers to maintain  
203 similar security and supervision standards as bars, even though they did not have DABS  
204 licenses.

205  
206 Commissioner Willardson expressed concern about serving liquor past midnight,  
207 suggesting that last call should be at midnight to avoid potential trouble.

208  
209 Commissioner Wright was unclear on why reception centers would have different rules  
210 than a bar establishment. Ms. Bergeson responded that they were different uses.  
211 Commissioner Muñoz commented that the applicant sought to operate during hours that  
212 were typical throughout Salt Lake County. It might feel unusual because this would be  
213 only the second bar establishment in Taylorsville.

214  
215 Commissioner Wright again questioned the difference between complaints of late nights  
216 and rowdiness at a reception center vs. at a bar. Chair Young pointed out that bars and  
217 reception centers had different regulatory requirements. While there had been complaints  
218 about loud music at reception centers, there was no plan for live music at The Break.

219  
220 Blake Brown, the operations manager for The Break Sports Bar and Grill, was invited to  
221 address the commission. He explained that they were had returned to their original  
222 proposal to operate until 1 AM every night, noting that the other bar in Taylorsville (Bout  
223 Time Pub) operated from 10 AM to 1 AM daily. Mr. Brown emphasized that their  
224 establishment would have DABS-trained staff who knew how to handle intoxicated  
225 patrons safely, unlike some reception centers. He mentioned they operated five other  
226 locations and wanted to maintain consistency across their establishments.

227  
228 When asked about the importance of Thursday night hours, Mr. Brown explained that  
229 Thursdays were as busy as Fridays and Saturdays for bars, and they didn't want to lose  
230 late-night business to competitors.

231  
232 Commissioner Wilkey raised questions about noise ordinance compliance and concerns  
233 about the impact on nearby residents, particularly regarding staff closing procedures until  
234 2 AM and potential early morning trash pickup. Ms. Bergeson confirmed that the  
235 establishment would need to comply with Salt Lake County's noise ordinances and noted  
236 that the trash enclosure had been relocated to a more appropriate location away from  
237 residential fences.

238  
239 Commissioner Murphy asked whether the applicants could close earlier on certain nights if  
240 they chose to, which Commissioner Young confirmed they could.

241  
242 After discussion among the commissioners about balancing business needs with

243 neighborhood concerns, and considering the six-month review period as a safeguard, the  
244 commission proceeded to vote.

245  
246 **MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved approve File #5C26-CUP-000589-2026 for a**  
247 **nonadministrative conditional use permit for extended hours of operation**  
248 **and to operate a bar establishment at 5418 South 1900 West based on the**  
249 **information, findings, and conditions presented in the staff report, but**  
250 **changing condition # 5 to read: Monday through Friday, open at 11 AM,**  
251 **last call at 1 AM, closed by 2 AM; Saturday through Sunday, open at 10**  
252 **AM, last call at 1 AM, closed by 2 AM. Commissioner McElreath seconded**  
253 **the motion. The motion passed with Commissioners Willardson and**  
254 **Wilkey voting in opposition.**

255  
256 **City Council Meeting Discussion:**

257  
258 Commissioner Muñoz reported on the March 18, 2026, City Council meeting.

259  
260 Commissioner Young assigned Commissioner Wilkey to report on the April 1st City  
261 Council meeting. When asked about the April 15th meeting, Commissioner Murphy  
262 indicated he would be unavailable due to travel, so Chair Young volunteered to cover that  
263 assignment.

264  
265 **ADJOURNMENT**

266  
267 **MOTION: Commissioner Murphy moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by**  
268 **Commissioner Muñoz and passed unanimously.**

269  
270 The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm

271  
272  
273  
274 \_\_\_\_\_  
275 Jamie Brooks, MMC  
276 City Recorder

277  
*Meeting Minutes Prepared with the Aid of HeyGov Artificial Intelligence*