

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2026
Briefing – 6:00 p.m. – Regular Session – 6:30 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

Attendance-

Planning Commission

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

Staff

Grant Allen – Senior Planner
Dina Blaes – Strategic Engagement
Jamie Brooks – City Recorder
Ryan Richards – Dep. City Attorney

Excused: Commissioner David Wright

Others Present: Ernest Burgess, Deeann Haroldsen, Tuyet Nguyen, Tammy North,
Tandie Nunez, Jonas Twu, Cassie Vallejo and Ricardo Vallejo

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

1. City Council Meeting Discussion

Commissioner McElreath attended the May 20th meeting of the City Council for Commissioner Wright, and he provided a brief update to the rest of the commissioners on that meeting as well as that of June 3rd.

Commissioner Willardson was assigned to attend and report on the June 17th City Council meeting.

It was reported that the July 1st City Council meeting had been cancelled.

Dina Blaes, Chief of Strategic Engagement, reported on various upcoming training opportunities for the commissioners.

The briefing session adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 P.M.

Chair Young called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. at which time he read a statement explaining the role of the planning commission.

Main Agenda:

2. Public Hearing and Consideration of Revocation or Modification of a Conditional Use Permit for a Reception Center with Extended Hours of Operation at 4164 South Carriage Square; File 19C23-CUP-000343-2023; Owner: Cassie Vallejo; – ***Dina Blaes***

Senior Planner Grant Allen explained that although Ms. Bergeson had been scheduled to present this item, she was unable to be present, so the item would be presented by Ms. Blaes.

Ms. Blaes provided background on the conditional use permit originally granted on June 27, 2023, to Cassie Vallejo, doing business as Healthy Vibes, for operation of a reception center at 4164 South Carriage Square — a location within 250 feet of residential properties, which had necessitated the non-administrative conditional use process and a public hearing at that time.

Ms. Blaes reviewed all thirteen of the conditions of approval that were laid out for the applicant following that 2023 public hearing:

1. The applicant must comply with all requirements of all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. The Conditional Use Permit is subject to review and revocation upon substantiated complaint or citation.
3. Any changes to the structure will require a building permit.
4. Compliance with applicable building and fire codes must be maintained.
5. The applicant shall remain compliant with all business licensing requirements.
6. The business must conform to Salt Lake County's noise ordinance.
7. Customers/ hosts may serve alcohol according to Department of Alcoholic Beverage Services (DABS) rules for private events only.
8. The sale of alcohol or hosting of public events is prohibited.
9. The maximum number of occupants was determined by the fire marshal and could not exceed forty-nine (49).
10. Events held on Friday and Saturday, and any associated music shall terminate by 12am; the property shall be completely vacant by 1am.
11. All other nights are subject to regular business operating hours; events shall terminate by 10pm.
12. Live music shall be terminated by 10pm on all nights.
13. A licensed security guard is required to be onsite for the full duration of the time that any customer or renter has access to the building

The following year, a city ordinance was adopted which required reception centers such as this one to post (visible from the building exterior) a list of the conditions as well as

contact information for a responsible person who could respond to the site within one hour if needed. This applicant was notified in writing of this new requirement.

Ms. Blaes walked the Commission through a documented timeline of violations and complaints stretching from January 2024 through March 2026, including multiple police responses to noise disturbances occurring after the approved hours of operation, anonymous resident complaints regarding after-hours events and loud music, failures to post the required business information form, and a period of delinquent business licensing. She noted that several certified letters mailed to the owner had been returned unclaimed, and that a code enforcement case had remained open for a period tracking multiple concurrent violations before being closed in December 2025. A new code case was opened following the most recent incident.

Of particular note was the police response on March 28, 2026, at approximately 1:03 a.m., in which Taylorsville police officers reported that music could be heard from 600 feet away and confirmed Healthy Vibes as the source. Officers further documented that individuals remained on-site past 1:00 a.m. and that no licensed security guard was present to facilitate vacation of the premises as required. Ms. Blaes cited this incident as the most recent and thoroughly documented violation, and one prompting staff's formal recommendation for revocation.

She explained that multiple conditions of approval — specifically conditions 6, 10, and 13 — had been persistently violated across several code enforcement cases; that the conduct violated the Salt Lake County Noise Ordinance; and that despite numerous warnings, courtesy notices, code enforcement actions, and direct communications, the violations had continued. Staff recommended revocation of the conditional use permit effective June 9, 2026, noting that the separate business license held by the owner for fitness and Zumba classes at the same location would not be affected.

Commissioner McElreath asked whether the photographs referenced in the staff findings had been included in the report. Ms. Blaes confirmed they were and displayed them, showing timestamped images from July and August 2025 documenting after-hours activity. Commissioner McElreath also asked how many total documented interactions — whether police responses or citizen complaints — had been recorded. Ms. Blaes walked through the full timeline, yielding an approximate count of nine to ten separate documented incidents or contacts. She stated that all the notices sent via certified mail were returned unclaimed.

Commissioner McElreath asked whether the original application had been prompted by the applicant operating without a license; Ms. Blaes confirmed that the record reflected the applicant had been operating as a reception center prior to obtaining the conditional use permit, and that this had been documented in the staff report.

Commissioner Wilkey asked for clarification regarding which police responses were formal written reports versus call logs. Ms. Blaes explained that not every police response generated a full written report — many were recorded as call logs indicating the officers'

119 response and resolution — but that these records were nonetheless documented. Deputy
120 City Attorney Ryan Richards

121 Commissioner Muñoz asked staff whether the Commission could set a future effective
122 date for revocation or impose modified conditions with a strict strike-out provision. Ms.
123 Blaes advised that the Commission's options were to either modify the existing 13
124 conditions in a substantive way — supported by specific findings that the modifications
125 would mitigate the identified harms — or to revoke the permit outright. She cautioned that
126 simply restating the same conditions already in place would amount to resetting the clock
127 without genuine change, and she did not recommend that course. She further advised
128 that any modification would need to be supported by new facts on the record. Mr. Richards
129 concurred.

130 Chair Young invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission. Cassie Vallejo
131 stepped to the podium and acknowledged the complaints and violations on the record but
132 emphasized that the documented incidents represented a small fraction of the total events
133 she had hosted over the course of three years. She stated that the vast majority of her
134 events had passed without complaint, and that she had made ongoing efforts to come
135 into compliance, including replacing security personnel, implementing a new security
136 system, and attempting to manage noise levels. She expressed that she bore
137 responsibility for the violations and accepted accountability, particularly acknowledging
138 that she was not always on-site during events and that her security guards had not always
139 fulfilled their obligations. She asked the Commission to consider modifying rather than
140 revoking her permit, indicating she was willing to accept any new or stricter conditions
141 rather than lose her license entirely. She noted she had upcoming bookings through
142 September 2026.

143 On the matter of unclaimed certified mail, Ms. Vallejo stated that she was unaware
144 certified notices had been sent to her address, as she had never received a green pickup
145 slip and had not known to retrieve certified mail from the post office. Ms. Blaes mentioned
146 that Ms. Bergeson confirmed via text message that the notices from her as well as code
147 enforcement were sent both by certified mail and regular mail to the applicant's home
148 address, and that Ms. Bergeson had received a call from Ms. Vallejo on the previous
149 Friday confirming receipt of the most recent one.

150 Commissioner Willardson expressed significant skepticism, stating that the record
151 demonstrated a pattern of non-compliance despite being given the opportunity to operate
152 in good faith. He indicated that reasonable business owners learn from the pattern, and
153 he was not persuaded that additional chances were warranted.

154 Commissioner Muñoz asked questions about the applicant's marketing practices, client
155 base, event types, and contract procedures. The applicant indicated she used social
156 media, business cards, and word-of-mouth, primarily hosting birthday parties, baptisms,
157 and weddings. She confirmed she required clients to sign contracts and collected
158 deposits, and that she was booked through September 2026. Commissioner Muñoz noted

159 the implications for those bookings should revocation be approved, and Ms. Blaes
160 confirmed that any booked events could not legally proceed following revocation.

161 Commissioner Murphy asked how frequently the applicant was personally on-site during
162 events. Ms. Vallejo indicated she was present when clients arrived to receive keys but
163 that she did not remain for the events, relying on contracted security guards. She
164 acknowledged this arrangement had proven problematic when security guards departed
165 before the required time.

166 Commissioner McElreath reflected that, as one of the commissioners who had voted in
167 favor of the original application in 2023, he had hoped the 13 carefully crafted conditions
168 would make the use viable for the neighborhood. He concluded, however, that the pattern
169 of violations indicated the location was simply not suitable for a reception center given its
170 proximity to residential properties, and that the Commission had extended good faith and
171 it had not been honored.

172 Chair Young opened the public hearing.

173
174 Tandee Nuñez said her neighbor (unable to be present) had stopped calling the police
175 when there were problems because she felt like it didn't help. Ms. Nuñez said she (herself)
176 had called many more times than was indicated in the staff report. She also said she had
177 called and texted the applicant numerous times, but that Ms. Vallejo had stopped picking
178 up. She said she had never had this problem with the previous owner or the owner of a
179 different reception center in the same complex. She also indicated that rather than
180 assuming that all the noise was coming from this particular business, she would get in
181 her car and drive to the location and confirm that it was indeed coming from Healthy
182 Vibes.

183 DeeAnn Carleton stated that the physical configuration of the area — with buildings
184 creating a canyon-like acoustic effect — made noise from the reception center
185 disproportionately impactful on neighboring homes. She noted her family had owned their
186 residence for approximately 60 years and that the noise problem had only emerged in
187 recent years.

188 Dr. Tuyet Nguyen was the president of the Carriage Square Property Owners Association
189 and represented the interests of the association's board of approximately six members
190 overseeing a shopping center with roughly 30 to 40 individual property owners. The
191 association's position was that the extended-hours operation had been a persistent
192 source of problems for surrounding residents and fellow tenants. She noted that the
193 business adjacent to Healthy Vibes had repeatedly complained about disruptive music
194 levels affecting both employees and customers. She concluded by stating the
195 association's view that a conditional use permit was a privilege and not a right, and that
196 continued operation would only magnify existing problems.

197 There was no one else who expressed a desire to speak, so Chair Young closed the
198 public hearing.

199

200 Commissioner McElreath asked Mr. Richards if he had reviewed the staff report and
201 wondered if he had anything to add. He had reviewed the staff report and police
202 documentation, adding that in his approximately 17 years of experience with criminal law
203 and police reports, it was not unusual for officers to seek compliance more than immediate
204 citation in such circumstances.

205 Commissioner Willardson pointed out that the city had invested a million dollars in
206 Carriage Square, with intent to strengthen the commercial vitality of the Carriage Square
207 corridor, and the concerns raised by the Property Owners Association regarding the
208 negative impact of after-hours disturbances on adjacent businesses and tenants are
209 relevant to the broader goal of protecting that public investment. Revocation of the permit,
210 as recommended by staff, was viewed as consistent with preserving the commercial and
211 residential quality of the area.

212 Commissioner Muñoz asked if the date of the CUP revocation could be changed to give
213 Ms. Vallejo the opportunity to wrap up some issues. Ms. Blaes said it could not be
214 changed unless the planning commission felt there was additional information they
215 needed in order to make an informed decision. If that were the case, she asked that they
216 be very specific about what information they felt they needed in order to support or refute
217 the findings in the staff report.

218

219 **MOTION: Commissioner Wilkey moved to revoke the approval of File #19C23-CUP-**
220 **000343-2023 for a conditional use permit to operate a reception center**
221 **with extended hours of operation for the property located at 4164 South**
222 **Carriage Square (or 4156 South 1785 West), based on the information**
223 **and findings in the staff report. The motion was seconded by**
224 **Commissioner McElreath and carried unanimously.**

225

226 The meeting recessed at 7:30 p.m. for a brief break before the work session.

227

228

229

230 **Work Session – 6:45 p.m. or Immediately Following the General Meeting**

231

1. Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance Preparation

232

233 The work session began at approximately 7:39 p.m.

234

235 Mr. Allen introduced Tammy North of Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District. Ms.
236 North addressed some of the water and sewer needs to keep in mind as future DADU
237 policy was created.

238

Some topics that were addressed included:

- Having one property owner in perpetuity for both the DADU and the primary residence unless the utility services were separated. (Something could be recorded on the property which would make it clear that separate services would be required if the property were to be subdivided in the future.)
- For particularly deep lots, a new fire hydrant could be necessary.
- Gravity-flow of sewer service should be required wherever possible.
- Consider whether or not a DADU could potentially be a duplex or triplex.
- DADU ordinance needed to be in place by October 1 according to recent legislation.
- Physical distance between the DADU and primary residence should be considered

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Jamie Brooks, MMC
City Recorder

Minutes created with the Aid of HeyGov Artificial Intelligence