

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 28, 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
Cindy Wilkey
David Wright
Don Russell

Staff

Grant Allen – Senior Planner
Dina Blaes – Strategic Engagement
Jamie Brooks – City Recorder
Ryan Richards – Dep. City Attorney
Betsy Valora – Dep. City Recorder
Keelan Iodice-Planning Intern

Excused: Commissioners B. Murphy (alternate) and Gordon Willardson

Others Present:

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

1. Detached Dwelling Unit Recap and Ordinance Work Plan

Planning Department staff presented an update on the Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (DADU) ordinance workplan. Planning Intern Mr. Keelan Iodice delivered the presentation, in which he summarized the project timeline and key policy questions that had emerged from prior work sessions. Staff had recently issued a scope of work to its consultant pool seeking assistance in drafting ordinance language, with one response already received. The proposed timeline called for a draft ordinance to be presented at the August 25th work session, with commissioner feedback incorporated prior to the September 22nd Planning Commission meeting, at which point a formal recommendation would be forwarded to the city council for adoption at their October 21st meeting.

Mr. Iodice recapped the substantive questions that had guided prior work sessions, including the application of existing accessory structure setbacks to DADUs, neighborhood character compatibility, size and height limitations, fire and life safety concerns, parking requirements, and utility lateral requirements. He noted that policy direction from prior sessions indicated that the ordinance should limit the DADU's impact on the primary residence, require owner-occupancy of either the primary residence or the DADU, and employ a setback-to-height ratio approach capping DADU

height relative to the primary structure. Staff identified three overarching priorities: state mandate compliance under Senate Bill 284, alignment with the General Plan's housing variety goals, and preservation of residential neighborhood character.

Chief of Strategic Engagement, Ms. Dina Blaes, and Planner, Mr. Grant Allen addressed commissioner questions. Commissioner Wilkey inquired whether a draft ordinance would be available for review prior to the August 25th meeting. Ms. Blaes clarified that staff intended to have the consultant deliver an initial draft by August 19th so that commissioners would have a working document in their packets before the work session, which allowed for more focused and productive feedback rather than beginning from a blank slate.

Commissioner Wright, who had not attended the second DADU work session, asked for clarification on the policy direction that had been reached. Mr. Allen summarized the discussion, which noted that significant attention had been devoted to utility connections and to height and setback parameters. Commissioner Wright expressed concern that the consensus direction, particularly the limitation that DADUs not exceed the height of the primary structure, was a conservative approach that could constrain design options. He asked whether the August 25th meeting would provide an opportunity to revisit those parameters. Mr. Allen confirmed that nothing had been codified into draft language yet and that the upcoming work session would allow for further refinement.

Ms. Blaes noted that SB 284 contained some internally contradictory language regarding local design guidelines, and she encouraged commissioners to read the bill directly. She also mentioned that some jurisdictions were exploring pre-approved "pattern book" architectural drawings as a mechanism for managing design standards within the state framework.

The Chair noted that no meeting was scheduled for September 8th due to the Labor Day holiday. He also asked whether a comparative review of other jurisdictions' adopted DADU ordinances would be available, and Mr. Allen confirmed that Mr. Iodice had compiled a library of ordinances from other cities for that purpose. The Chair expressed a personal preference for design flexibility, citing carriage-house-style structures as an example of a DADU form that could be compatible with neighborhood character while allowing for greater height. Mr. Allen reiterated that all parameters remained open for discussion.

2. City Council Meeting Review

Commissioner Muñoz reported on the July 15th meeting. The July 1 meeting had been cancelled.

Commissioners Wilkey and Murphy would report back on the August 5th and 19th meetings respectively. With Commissioner Murphy being absent, Commission Young would get with him to verify that he would be available for the assignment.

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 P.M.

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

Consent Agenda

3. Consider the Minutes of the June 9, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION: Commissioner McElreath moved to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2026, Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell. The motion carried, with commissioner Wright abstaining due to absence from that meeting.

Main Agenda

4. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Zoning Text Amendment Request to Adopt Chapter 13.46 SSD-R 24-Hour Residential Zoning District for the Properties at Approximately 5718 S, 5766 S, and 5770 S 1900 W in Taylorsville, Utah; File #2Z25-DCA-000531-2025; Applicant: Evan Haslam (Dwell Design Studio) and Mark Isaac (Pinyon 8 Consulting); Presenter: Terryne Bergeson

5. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Zoning Map Amendment Request, Amending the Taylorsville Zoning Map from Regional Commercial to SSD-R 24-Hour Residential for the Properties at Approximately 5718 S, 5766 S and 5770 S 1900 West in Taylorsville, Utah; File #3Z26-DCA-000602-2026; Applicants Evan Haslam (Dwell Design Studio) and Mark Isaac (Pinyon 8 Consulting).

Items 4 and 5 were presented jointly. Planner Ms. Terryne Bergeson explained that the review sequence involved a concurrent zoning text amendment and zoning map amendment, and that the Planning Commission's role at that meeting was to receive the proposal, conduct a public hearing, and provide substantive feedback so that the applicant could return with a revised plan. A formal recommendation to City Council would be made at a subsequent meeting.

The subject properties consisted of three parcels at the rear of the Crossroads Shopping Center at the end of 1900 West, including the site of the former 24-Hour Fitness facility, the Virg's Restaurant, and the Old Spaghetti Factory parcel. The Old Spaghetti Factory building was proposed to remain unchanged with its own parking. The proposal sought to adopt site-specific zoning standards under the SSD process, which was required by code for multifamily projects exceeding five acres. Ms. Bergeson noted that the properties were designated Commercial High Intensity in the General Plan and were identified as one of the city's five percent districts—areas intended to absorb higher residential densities to preserve existing neighborhoods. The proposal was also consistent with the CenterPoint site-specific planning area's recommendations for incremental upgrades, residential integration, and mixed-use intensification. Because the project aligned with the existing General Plan designations, no General Plan map amendment was required.

The applicant proposed two five-story residential buildings totaling 414 units, with studios, one-, two-, and three-bedroom floor plans. Building 100, the larger structure, would contain 250 units and wrap around a seven-deck parking structure. Building 200 would contain 159 units with a courtyard design. The proposed gross density was approximately 72.76 units per acre, significantly exceeding the 15–50+ units per acre range referenced in the General Plan's design guidelines for five percent districts, though Ms. Bergeson noted the guideline used the phrase "50 plus."

The applicant proposed 590 stalls within the parking structure plus 26 shared stalls on the adjacent commercial property, for a total of 616 stalls, or approximately 1.48 stalls per unit. This fell below the city's standard land development code requirement of approximately 802 stalls. Staff recommended a ratio of 1.75 stalls per unit, with 0.25 of those designated for guest parking, which at the current stall count would support a reduction to approximately 352 units.

A traffic study was submitted and updated in June 2026. The studied intersections showed current level-of-service ratings as low as "D" at the I-215 westbound off-ramp at Redwood Road, which was noted as an acceptable rating. The study found that with the project in place and the proposed change of the east-west drive aisle in front of Target to westbound-only traffic, overall level-of-service ratings at the studied intersections would not change materially, with the exception of a minor degradation from "A" to "B" at the Raising Cane's exit onto Redwood Road.

The two primary access points to the site were 1900 West and the east-west drive aisle running in front of Target. Staff noted that making 1900 West a public road was not feasible given right-of-way constraints and existing utilities. As a result, all roads within the project would remain private. The applicant proposed adding a sidewalk along the east side of 1900 West to improve pedestrian connectivity for residents walking to and from the shopping center. The east-west drive aisle would be converted to westbound-only traffic, with a landscape island and curb installed beginning at the Guitar Center to discourage eastbound through-traffic. Commissioner Wright raised questions about

whether pedestrian connectivity could also be extended southward toward the Sierra Trading Post frontage, and the applicant indicated they would explore that possibility before returning to the Commission. Chair Young also noted that the road narrowed as it extended south along 1900 West and asked about the feasibility of installing sidewalk in that narrowed section; staff and the applicant confirmed the sidewalk would be placed within the existing landscape strip. Ms. Blaes clarified that the southern portion of 1900 West was privately owned by the Crossroads of Taylorsville shopping center.

Ms. Bergeson noted that fire code generally required access within 150 feet of all sides of a building. Building 100, at approximately 444 feet in length, presented access challenges along its south side. The Unified Fire Authority had visited the site and indicated that in a worst-case scenario, emergency access to Building 200 could be achieved via the Summerwood Apartments property, though this was not a designated access point. Staff recommended an increased setback along the southeastern portion of Building 100 to provide improved fire access, potentially designed as usable outdoor space.

Ms. Blaes disclosed that staff had received an initial comment from the fire marshal recommending a reduction to as few as 200 units based on fire safety concerns, which she characterized as a significant surprise. Staff subsequently convened a meeting with Unified Fire at which an additional fire marshal reviewed the applicable code in detail. That meeting clarified that alternate means and methods—including standpipes, wall hydrants, and additional suppression systems—could potentially address the access deficiencies. Staff acknowledged that this late-stage fire comment was problematic and described changes to the internal process that would ensure Unified Fire was engaged in greater detail at the conceptual plan stage going forward.

Mark Isaac, owner's representative with Pinyon 8 Consulting, and Steve Jones, principal of Dwell Design Studio, presented on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Isaac described the project's genesis, noting that the vacant 24-Hour Fitness building had proven difficult to reuse or lease for nearly seven years and that the location, while challenging for retail circulation, was well-suited for high-density residential given its walkable access to the surrounding retail, restaurant, and grocery amenities. He emphasized the level of pre-application coordination the team had undertaken with city engineering, traffic, utility, and fire departments over approximately two years.

Mr. Isaac addressed parking economics directly, explaining that each parking stall in the proposed structure cost approximately \$45,000 to construct, and that reducing the unit count to 352 while maintaining the same parking structure would increase the per-unit parking cost to approximately \$73,000–\$74,000. He argued that the 1.75 ratio recommended by staff was high relative to comparable projects along the Wasatch Front, where 1.38–1.5 stalls per unit were more common, and that shared parking with the adjacent commercial uses—particularly given that retail peak hours and residential overnight demand were largely non-overlapping—provided a meaningful supplement.

194 He also noted the project would generate no spillover into city streets and would
195 represent a \$120 million investment in the community.

196 Mr. Jones confirmed that Building 100 used a wrap design, with residential units
197 surrounding the parking structure rather than sitting above it. He affirmed that life safety
198 was the foremost priority of the design team and that the project would be designed in
199 full compliance with applicable fire code, including the use of alternate means and
200 methods where access constraints existed.

201 Commissioners raised additional questions regarding transit connectivity, rent rates,
202 landscaping, and whether a mixed-use or retail component had been considered. On
203 transit, Mr. Isaac acknowledged the development would be car-centric and that no
204 formal UTA coordination had been initiated, citing the premature stage of the project.
205 On rent rates, he indicated construction costs of approximately \$275,000 per unit before
206 parking, pointing to a likely minimum rent of around \$2.25 per square foot, or roughly
207 \$2,000 per month for a 700-square-foot unit. Ms. Blaes noted that Taylorsville's median
208 rental rate as of the first quarter of 2026 was \$2,011 per month according to the Kem
209 Gardner Policy Institute. On landscaping, Commissioner Wright encouraged the
210 applicant to pursue meaningful landscape enhancements given that the site was
211 currently heavily paved. On mixed use, Mr. Isaac cautioned that mandating ground-floor
212 retail in multifamily buildings frequently resulted in vacant commercial space that
213 burdened residential tenants through higher rents and argued that the project
214 constituted "horizontal mixed use" given its adjacency to the existing retail environment.

215 Commissioner Wilkey asked directly whether it was possible to attract retail back to the
216 vacant space rather than rezoning for residential. Mr. Isaac acknowledged that retail
217 interest was returning nationally after a decade of decline but maintained that this
218 particular site's location and access challenges made it unsuitable for traditional
219 destination retail.

220 Chair Young opened the public hearing.

221 Gordon Palmer, owner of the adjacent Summerwood Apartments, addressed the
222 Commission. Mr. Palmer stated that he had operated the property for 46 years and had
223 anticipated that residential development would eventually come to the vacant parcels.
224 He expressed concern about parking overflow, noting that the shopping center's existing
225 parking was already heavily utilized on busy evenings, and questioned whether the
226 Crossroads property owners fully understood the volume of vehicles that would result
227 from the proposed unit count. He expressed support for a smaller apartment complex,
228 consistent with the fire marshal's earlier suggestion of approximately 200 units. Mr.
229 Palmer also raised doubts about the viability of emergency fire access via the Fairwood
230 Drive corridor, noting that the area between the properties was constrained by double
231 fencing and dense landscaping. He expressed concern about additional traffic pressure
232 on the 1900 West and 5600 South intersection, which he described as already heavily
233 congested.

Chair Young closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to continue File #2Z25-DCA-000531-2025 and File #3Z26-DCA-000602-2026 to a future Planning Commission meeting for the following specific reasons: to address fire access, parking, landscaping, and related concerns. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell and carried unanimously.

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Young and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Betsy Valora
Deputy City Recorder

Minutes created with the Aid of HeyGov Artificial Intelligence