

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
July 14, 2026
Briefing – 6pm / Regular Session – 6:30 pm
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Planning Commission

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

Staff

Dina Blaes, Strategic Engagement
Grant Allen, Senior Planner
Terryne Bergeson, Planner II
Jamie Brooks, City Recorder
Ryan Richards, Deputy City Atty

Others Present: Dana Anderson, John Anderson, Carrie Ashby, Angela Barber, Nicole Broadhead, Walter Brown, Carla (unknown last name), Lloyd Cole, Melisa Dizdarević, Rob Farr, Matt Gough, Chad Hathaway, Jenn Hathaway, Kevin Helper, Walter Klein, Bob Knudsen, Joseph Knorr, Nanci Kroll, Amy Lefler, Bailee Lefler, Bob Lefler, William Lott, Melissa (unknown last name), Harvey Mathis, Isaiah Moore, Larry Paulsen, Corinne Perrine, Shayne Perrine, Ana Ruiz, Armando Ruiz, Brock Smith, Carla Smith, Clint Smith, Laurie Smith, Madison Smith, Larry Soldivar, Pam Soldivar, Joseph Thorne, Robert Weaver and many others

Present Electronically: Isabel (unknown last name), Cristian Flores, Angela Wayman, and Jena Wright

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:00 PM

Due to technical difficulties with the audio/video equipment, there was no 6:00pm briefing session held and the items listed on that portion of the agenda were not addressed.

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 PM

At 6:34 p.m., Chair Young read the welcome statement, explaining the role of the planning commission.

Consent Agenda

MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed unanimously.

Main Agenda

4. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Nonadministrative Conditional Use Permit to Construct a Utility Facility at 1298 W 4800 S. in Taylorsville, Utah; File 12C26-CUP-000608-2026; Applicant: Angela Barber (representing Enbridge Gas); Subject Property: 1298 West 4800 South and 1285 W Taylorsville Expressway

Planner Terryne Bergeson explained that File #12C26-CUP-000608-2026 involved an application submitted by Enbridge Gas to construct a public utility facility at the subject property. Ms. Bergeson explained that the subject parcels were zoned as single-family residential. Enbridge Gas sought to construct a gas regulator station within a utility easement within the larger of the two parcels which was owned by Fore Lakes Golf Course. The types of acceptable uses were outlined in Taylorsville Municipal Code 13.11.240. She briefly reviewed the analysis that the application had undergone, including reviewing it for compliance with the standards outlined in the city's Land Development Code. A notice had been sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property seeking public input. However, no public comment or inquiries were received. The facility would be located a sufficient distance from existing habitable structures and the right-of-way.

Twelve findings were listed in the staff report and displayed on the screen, after which Ms. Bergeson reviewed the following recommended conditions of approval:

- 1) The applicant shall continue to work with staff to resolve any outstanding review comments on submitted plans.
- 2) A lot consolidation for the two subject properties shall be completed and recorded with the county recorder's office. Verification shall be provided to the city prior to issuance of final approval of the conditional use permit.
- 3) The plans shall show compliance with §13.11.240 and all other applicable city, state, and federal laws.
- 4) Final approval of the conditional use permit is deferred to the Community and Economic Development director.

Commissioner Wright requested further details regarding the staff analysis which Ms. Bergeson then provided, noting that what was labeled as a "property line" was actually a fence line.

Chair Young invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission. Angela Barber of Enbridge Gas introduced herself and responded to a variety of questions from Commissioner Wright, as did Enbridge engineer Melisa Dizdarević. They explained that the subject parcel would house a regulator station to reduce high-pressure natural gas for use in the community. It would replace an existing station approximately ¼ mile south which would be retired. Ms. Dizdarević described some of the measures that were in place to ensure public safety.

Chair Young opened the public hearing.

Lloyd Cole said he lived directly in front of the subject property and expressed concern about the potential for “blow off” or escaping odors. Ms. Dizdarević returned to the dais to respond to his questions. Mr. Cole also wondered about potentially affecting property values.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to approve File #12C26-CUP-000608-2026 public hearing and consideration for a nonadministrative conditional use permit to construct a public utility station at 1298 West 4800 South and 1285 West Taylorsville Expressway based on the information, findings and conditions of approval in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Willardson and passed unanimously.

5. Consideration of a Reasonable Accommodation Request for a Recovery Residence at 1427 W. Stern Dr., in Taylorsville, Utah; File No. 02SI26-SI-RA-000616-2026; Brock Smith, Applicant; Subject Property 1427 W Stern Drive

Senior Planner Grant Allen began by explaining that the applicant was in the process of working with the State of Utah to become licensed to operate a Recovery Residence for individuals recovering from substance addiction. Taylorsville Municipal Code §13.11.70 governed standards for such facilities and a maximum of four unrelated adults could currently reside in a single-family home. The applicant had submitted a Reasonable Accommodation Request to increase that number to eight plus two guardians as provided in §13.11.070(f)(2). Mr. Allen pointed out that the pertinent city code was designed to comply with state law and avoid discrimination against disabled individuals pursuant to both the Utah and Federal Fair Housing Acts. He displayed a slide showing various requirements of such facilities as outlined in UCA §26B-2-101 before displaying the proposed floor plans of both levels of the dwelling and a letter from the applicant outlining his request. He explained

that the applicant had indicated their program model followed those that suggested that eight residents was the ideal number for a successful peer group. Mr. Allen then reviewed the analysis conducted by city staff and pointed out that their findings were listed in the staff report.

Commissioner McElreath asked if the home was currently occupied. Mr. Allen responded that the applicant owned the property but that it was vacant pending issuance of a rental license.

Commissioner Willardson shared his opinion that a majority of individuals in such facilities would end up robbing neighbors. He felt even four people were too many, not to mention eight.

Commissioner Wilkey asked if there was sufficient parking for the requested use. Mr. Allen responded that the residents would not be licensed drivers and the two guardians would be able to park in the garage, which would leave two vacant parking spots in the driveway.

Commissioner Wilkey then asked if Elevated Recovery was an existing company with experience running this type of facility. Mr. Allen indicated he would let the applicant respond to that question himself.

At the invitation of Chair Young, applicant Brock Smith stepped to the lectern and explained that he was the co-owner and program director of Elevated Recovery. He clarified that this facility was *not* for rehabilitation but for recovery. He indicated that these residents will have already completed intensive treatment and were transitioning back into the community from residential treatment. He said that such facilities were located throughout Salt Lake County.

Commissioner Willardson asked what the expected success rate was. Mr. Smith said it depended on many factors, but he and his partner had run a similar facility with 17 residents and had a 70% success rate as tracked by Salt Lake County.

As to the parking issue, he clarified that while the residents might have driver's licenses, it was more likely that they would not. Typically, they would become licensed *after* this stage of their recovery, but he indicated his staff could monitor the parking situation to ensure it did not become a problem.

Mr. Smith pointed out that his success rate was a testament to the quality of the program within a supportive community with structure and live-in staff members.

In response to questions from Commission Wright, Mr. Smith indicated that residents would typically stay at the home three to six months. He also explained that there were

policies/procedures in place including room checks, backpack checks, and eyes on residents every day. There were also intervention plans in place in case someone slipped up which included mentoring fellow residents and weekly drug tests.

Commissioner Wright shared additional questions he had with Mr. Smith who explained that this was not a half-way house for the recently incarcerated, nor was it a home for the developmentally disabled. It was strictly for non-violent adult males with substance abuse disorder who were in recovery and wanted to change their lives for the better. He pointed out that the Americans with Disabilities Act covered substance abuse recovery such as this.

Chair Young encouraged Mr. Smith to get to know the neighbors and establish a line of communication so that they would know how to reach him if needed. Mr. Smith indicated that was his plan, and he pointed out that he intended to live on the property for the first year. He also intended to keep the exterior well-maintained and said that living in a home that they could feel some pride in would help his clients feel good about the direction their life was taking.

Commissioner Wilkey asked if the 8-person model had been proven effective. Mr. Smith said he was a former therapist and pointed out that the target number of clients in such a program was between eight and twelve. A lower number reduced group accountability and he felt it was important to have two people per room. It was also important to avoid feelings of isolation and loneliness. Eight clients provided an opportunity for genuine connection.

Commissioner Willardson pointed out that having eight clients rather than four was essentially doubling his profit. He said he would not want the facility in his neighborhood.

Commissioner Muñoz asked if the business model was sustainable if there were only four clients. He did not believe it was. She also asked if his services could be billed to health insurance. He responded that they could not and clients instead had to pay out of their own pocket although Salt Lake County and treatment centers provided some funding.

Commissioner McElreath asked staff how many of this facility type were in Taylorsville and if the city could legally regulate how many there were.

Chief of Strategic Engagement Dina Blaes responded that the city could not regulate the number of such homes due to the fair housing act. If a facility could meet the requirements, the city could not deny their application

Commissioner Wilkey said she would prefer a 6-person limit over 8 and wondered if the applicant would be amenable to that.

Mr. Smith said that an 8-person limit would provide the best benefit if there were seven others for clients to connect with and be accountable to. He reiterated that it increased the likelihood of success. Commissioner Wilkey encouraged him to ask for less, but he felt strongly that 8-12 residents was the most appropriate range.

Ms. Blaes interjected that current city code already allowed eight residents plus two staff. Therefore, she did not see a path to denial. If the planning commission wished to see the code changed, that was a discussion for another day.

In response to an earlier question, Mr. Allen said there was one other approved recovery facility in the city. He assumed it also had eight residents but did not know that for sure.

Commissioner Wright asked if there were any other types of residential facilities. There were, but that would require further research.

While agreeing that these facilities were of value, Commissioner Wright expressed concern that Taylorsville was becoming a magnet for them. Ms. Blaes responded that it was possible for the city to discuss putting proximity boundaries in place, but that it was not appropriate to have the discussion when the planning commission had a current application under consideration.

Commissioner Muñoz asked if the Commission could approve the application conditionally and Ms. Blaes responded in the negative, pointing out that this was not a conditional use application. Ms. Bergeson reminded her that the facility would be reviewed annually as part of the rental license renewal process.

MOTION: Commissioner McElreath moved to approve File #02SI26-SI-RA-000616-2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell and all commissioners voted in favor of the motion except Commissioner Willardson who voted no.

7. Consideration of a Continued Nonadministrative Conditional Use Permit to Operate a Used Car Dealership at 1661 West 4800 South; File 9C26-CUP-000596-2026; Applicant: Bernabe Ojeda Cruz; Subject Property: 1661 West 4800 South.

Mr. Allen reminded the Planning Commission that this item was first presented at the May 12, 2026 meeting. At that time, the Commission had requested that the applicant return with a revised and to-scale site plan including parking tabulations for display, customer, and employee spaces; a striping plan; a response to concerns about exterior lighting; and square footage information for other tenant spaces within the structure.

Mr. Allen reported that the applicant had worked with the property owner to produce an updated site diagram showing 10 dedicated display spaces, 2 customer spaces, and 2 employee spaces, with the remaining 24 spaces designated as shared among property tenants. Total parking on the site was represented as 38 stalls. Staff also noted that the applicant had submitted a statement of business operations committing to compliance with Taylorsville Municipal Code.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Wilkey, Mr. Allen noted that the reference in his staff report to 10 stalls allocated to Prosperity Car should have been 14 stalls.

However, Mr. Allen raised two significant concerns. First, the applicant had an open code enforcement case for operating without a business license, which had originally triggered the conditional use permit process — a matter that must be resolved through obtaining the permit itself. Second, and more troubling to Mr. Allen, was a recently opened code enforcement case for storing a wrecked vehicle on the property. Staff expressed concern that these active enforcement matters were inconsistent with the applicant's written commitment to abide by city regulations. Staff further noted that the submitted site plan was not drawn to scale and that it depicted landscaping that did not exist on-site. This would need to be corrected as part of the conditions of approval.

Staff presented updated conditions of approval, including a revised requirement that the applicant submit a properly scaled striping plan meeting the city's parking and access code requirements, and a shortened administrative review period of 30 days following issuance of the business license, rather than the previously proposed six months. An additional condition was proposed requiring that the business license and conditional use permit be subject to review upon receipt of any substantiated complaint or citation.

The applicant appeared with an interpreter. He indicated that the damaged vehicle had been present for only a few hours while awaiting a tow and was removed the same day, and that all other vehicles on the lot were insured and legally parked. The applicant expressed a commitment to comply with all city requirements and to work cooperatively with staff.

Commissioner McElreath noted that this was the second time the item had come before the Commission and expressed comfort with moving forward, given the conditions staff had imposed, and confidence that the city's active code enforcement would monitor compliance. Commissioner Wright raised concerns about the functionality of the site diagram, noting that vehicle maneuvering appeared problematic in certain areas of the lot. Staff acknowledged the diagram did not accurately reflect current site conditions and confirmed that any approved striping plan would be reviewed by staff and the city engineer for compliance.

Staff currently recommended the following nine conditions of approval:

- 1) Applicant must resolve existing open enforcement cases within 30 days of the approval of this conditional use permit.
- 2) The following was not to occur on site (including but not limited to): intensive mechanical repair, dismantling, body work, painting, engine work, or restoration activities.
- 3) Restriping, boundary striping, signs and/or posts will be required to be installed as indicated on submitted site plan.
- 4) Parking for the dealership shall only use identified parking spaces and other designated areas as marked on the site plan and parking tabulation included in the exhibits.
- 5) Parking on the site shall be upon a paved surface and shall comply with applicable standards in the Taylorsville Land Development Code.
- 6) Storage of inoperable, wrecked, dismantled, salvage, or abandoned vehicles is prohibited.
- 7) An administrative review shall take place six months after the date of issuance of business license to ensure compliance. The director may decide that the findings of the review must be presented to the Planning Commission to consider modifying or adding conditions.
- 8) The conditional use permit is subject to the same review outlined above upon receipt of substantiated complaint or citation.
- 9) The operation shall remain compliant with all applicable city and state review agencies.

MOTION: Commissioner Russell moved to approve File #9C26-CUP-000596-2026, a request for a nonadministrative conditional use permit to operate a used car dealership at 1661 West 4800 South in Taylorsville, Utah, subject to the findings and conditions in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkey and passed unanimously.

8. Public Hearing and Consideration of Preliminary Plat to Create 2 Single Family Residential Lots at 4795 S Simper Lane; File 1S26-SUB-000576-2025; Subject property: 4795 South Simper Lane; Grant Allen, Presenter.

Mr. Allen explained that this applicant sought to subdivide an existing lot of approximately 17,000 square feet at 4795 South Simper Lane into two single-family residential lots. The property was zoned R-1-8 and designated Low Density Residential on the General Plan map. The proposed split would divide the lot nearly equally, retaining the existing home on the eastern lot while creating a new buildable lot to the west.

The central compliance issue identified by staff was that the proposed subdivision would require the removal of an existing detached garage currently serving the home on the eastern lot. Under the Land Development Code, all homes in R-1 and R-2 districts were required to maintain a two-car garage. Removing the garage without providing a replacement would create a new nonconformity. The applicant had not yet submitted a solution to this issue, and staff recommended that the Commission grant preliminary plat approval conditioned on the applicant providing a to-scale drawing demonstrating a conforming off-street parking solution prior to recording the final plat.

Staff also noted that the current access from Simper Lane was nonconforming due to its proximity to the corner intersection, and that the proposed subdivision would provide an opportunity to relocate that access to Dickinson Drive, which would be a preferable outcome.

Chair Young invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Applicant Armando Ruiz acknowledged the garage requirement, stating that he was working on addressing the issue. The Chair indicated that the Commission might call for a continuance in order to provide him with sufficient time to work with staff, understand applicable setback and dimension requirements, and present conforming drawings — without placing undue restrictions on him at this stage.

Chair Young opened the public hearing

Jennifer Hathaway said she lived kitty-corner from the subject property. She expressed concern about parking availability on the already narrow Simper Lane but indicated that as long as parking and accessibility concerns were adequately addressed, she would likely not object to the subdivision.

No one else expressed a desire to speak, so the Chair closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to continue File No. 1S26-SUV-000576-2025 to a future Planning Commission meeting to allow applicant to present required drawings to resolve nonconforming issues. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkey and passed unanimously.

9. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Text Amendment Request Amending Chapter 13.38 SSD-X Bennion Point (Summit Vista) to Reduce the Height-Setback Ratio for Buildings Exceeding Thirty-Five Feet in Height; File 7Z26-DCA-000620-2026; Applicant: Rob Weaver of KGRW & Associates (Representing Summit Vista); Subject Properties 6084 S, 6040 S, 6020 S, 6030 S, 6133 S Summit Vista Blvd; 6100 S, 6160 S, 6170 S 3200 W; 3220 W 6200 S; and 3455 W 6135 S; Presenter: Terryne Bergeson

Ms. Bergeson presented the application submitted by the Summit Vista development team, represented by architect Robert Weaver of KJIW Associates. The request sought to amend Chapter 13.38 of the Land Development Code — the Summit Vista-specific SSD zoning ordinance — to reduce the height-to-setback ratio for buildings exceeding 35 feet in height from 2.25 horizontal feet per vertical foot of building height to 1.90 horizontal feet per vertical foot.

Ms. Bergeson provided background on the Summit Vista project, noting that the SSD zone and accompanying development agreement were adopted in 2015, and that the project had undergone a significant update in 2024 when the development team returned to seek a reduction in the minimum density requirement. That reduction had been granted after the team demonstrated a market shift toward larger two-bedroom units, which reduced overall unit counts. The current application arose from the team's desire to return some of those lost units to the planned Neighborhood 2 residential buildings — not by expanding footprints or adding new structures, but by building taller.

Staff's analysis identified four residential buildings in Neighborhood 2 that would be affected by the setback ratio: RB 2.2 (130 feet from the nearest residential property line, currently limited to approximately 61 feet in height), RB 2.3 (147 feet from the nearest residential property line, currently limited to approximately 65 feet), RB 2.4 (sufficiently far from residential to reach the existing 7-story/90-foot maximum without any amendment), and RB 2.5 (169 feet from the nearest residential property line, currently limited to approximately 75 feet). The proposed reduction in the ratio would allow RB 2.2 to reach approximately 72.5 feet and RB 2.3 to reach approximately 77 feet — sufficient in both cases to accommodate a sixth story. Staff noted that the applicant had submitted architectural renderings showing how the added story would be handled through massing articulation and material variation to reduce its visual impact.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council, citing alignment with the General Plan's mixed-use high-intensity designation and the city's broader 5-percent-district strategy of concentrating density growth in targeted areas to preserve surrounding single-family neighborhoods.

Commission Muñoz asked if there would be any grading changes made to the property. Ms. Bergeson indicated that there were large differences in the grading throughout the project and she would not be comfortable answering the question without the grading plan in front of her. She did point out that building measurement would be taken from the grade at each building.

Commissioner Wilkey asked how many units were planned prior to 2024. Ms. Bergeson could not recall that number but thought the density had been reduced from 23 or more units per acre down to 22 per acre.

Commissioner McElreath wished to confirm that in 2024 there was only a change in the density—there had not been a request for increased height. Ms. Bergeson confirmed that was correct.

Chair Young invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Robert Weaver, an architect with KGRW & Associates introduced himself, explaining that Summit Vista Chief Executive Officer Walter Klein was also in attendance. He highlighted some of the improvements planned for Neighborhood 2. Regarding Commissioner Muñoz's question pertaining to grading, he explained that because all the buildings were interconnected, there would not be large elevation differences.

Commissioner Willardson pointed out that taller buildings meant increased profit for the developer. He was concerned about the residents of nearby single-family homes.

Walter Klein, Summit Vista's Chief Executive Officer pointed out that they had lowered the density and merely wanted to return to the previous level.

(Note: At 8:35pm there was a power surge, and the Zoom recording and microphones were disabled for several minutes.)

Chair Young opened the public hearing.

Isaiah Moore expressed concern about further limiting views of nearby homeowners who had already suffered from decreased property values. He suggested the applicants themselves would not wish to live by this project and he agreed with Commissioner Willardson's comments.

Carrie Ashby lived north of Summit Vista and said there was already 6'-8' of dirt built up on the site. She complained of falling pictures in her home and wondered if the construction work had resulted in foundation issues on her property.

Nancy Krol said her home would end up being directly behind Building 2.2. She spoke in opposition to increasing heights and said she did not want to have people looking down into her yard, blocking her garden from the sun, looking in her windows, etc. She said she purchased her home for beauty and serenity, both of which were now gone. She also mentioned that she had doors in her home that did not close properly due to the construction of Summit Vista. She urged the Planning Commission to vote no.

Aaron Lawrence said nearby homeowners were not aware that this project was coming, had already lost their view and had no privacy on their property. He turned to face the applicant when he spoke but was reminded to address the Planning Commission only. He had enough of the vibrations caused by Summit Vista construction and pointed out that those doing shift work had to sleep during the day, which was very difficult. He suggested there was a lack of water and other resources available and did not feel more units should be allowed.

Bailee Lefler said the views from those living in nearby homes had been “completely distorted” by the buildings that had already been built. She loved Taylorsville and Summit Vista but despite that, she was strongly opposed to the proposed changes. Although she knew that growth was important, she did not think larger buildings reflected growth. Instead, she said they represented loss. She asked the Commission to consider reducing the project’s impact and allow neighbors to have some peace.

Joseph Thorn owned property adjacent to Summit Vista and wondered if the buildings would be even higher than seven stories. Like those before him, he was concerned about the loss of privacy and reduced property values.

Rob Farr explained that he was a photographer by trade, and he pointed out that the renderings shown were taken from a very wide angle which made them appear farther away than they really were. He mentioned that the mayors of Seattle and New York City were voted out of office because their opponents were fighting corporate greed. He could not believe that the City Council had approved even five stories, let alone seven.

Nicole Broadhead said Summit Vista was now in her back yard. She had no privacy and had lost her mountain and sunset views.

Amy Lefler asserted that many current Summit Vista residents were opposed to this change.

There was no one else attending in person who expressed a desire to speak, so Chair Young asked Ms. Bergeson if anyone attending electronically wished to. Ms. Bergeson read the comment of Jena Wright who expressed concern about views being blocked. She also read portions of two comments submitted via email before the meeting: McKenna Scott

reiterated privacy concerns and loss of natural light and also said that she purchased her home based on the development approvals in place at that time.

Chair Young closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Wright asked staff to clarify the number of units approved in 2015, 2024 and now. Ms. Blaes asked Ms. Bergeson to look at the older applications to get that information. For now, she could only say that the most recent approval was for a minimum of 22 units per acre and a maximum of 30 units per acre.

Commissioner Muñoz stated that the Commission had previously been asked to reduce the density and were now being asked to increase it. Ms. Blaes agreed but pointed out that at one point the Planning Commission and City Council had approved 3000 total units. It was not uncommon for changes to be made based on market conditions and shifts. Moreover, the city's General Plan recognized that Taylorsville would need to produce between 7,000 and 12,000 additional housing units by the year 2050 in order to accommodate an expected influx of people.

Ms. Bergeson interjected that although she had not yet located the 2015 proposal in her files, she thought it had been for approximately 1,650 units. The 2024 proposal was for 1,644 units at full build-out, and this proposal was for 1,847 at full buildout. The allowable density range in this SSD (site-specific development) was between 1,658 and 2,260 units.

Commissioner Wright commented that density was needed everywhere—not just in Taylorsville-- and this was one of the areas where the General Plan called for it.

Commissioner McElreath asked why staff recommended a positive recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Bergeson said it was because the proposal aligned with the density provided in the General Plan designation and because this area was designated as part of the 5% of Taylorsville that could support increased it.

Commissioner Russell asked if Summit Vista would be considered built out if 1,847 units were ultimately built. Ms. Bergeson said that it would be.

MOTION: Commissioner McElreath moved to send a negative recommendation to the City Council for File # 7Z26-DCA-000620-2026, a zoning text amendment request amending Chapter 13.38 SSD-X Bennion Point (Summit Vista) to reduce the setback to height ratio for buildings exceeding thirty-five feet in height. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed unanimously after a roll call vote.

Commissioner McElreath thanked the applicants for coming in but said that the agreement said one thing in 2015 and now the applicant wanted to move the goal posts. He felt the current setback to height ratio should remain.

10. Public Hearing and Consideration of a General Plan Map Amendment Request, Amending Chapter 3 of the Taylorsville General Plan, and Future Land Use Map from Mixed Use High Intensity to Residential High Density, located generally at 3855 W 5400 S; File 1GP26-GPLAN-000609-2026; Applicant: Edge Homes; Subject Property 3855 W 5400 S; Grant Allen, Presenter

11. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Zoning Text Amendment Request Repealing Chapter 13.42 SSD-X-West Point Zoning District and Enacting 13.43 SSD-R-Solstice at 54th Zoning District located generally at 3855 West 5400 South; File 5Z26-DCA-000610-2026; Applicant: Edge Homes; Grant Allen, Presenter

12. Public Hearing and Consideration of a Zoning Map Amendment Request, Amending the Taylorsville Zoning Map from SSD West Point to SSD Solstice at 54th located generally at 3855 West 5400 South; File 6Z26-DCA-000611-2026; Applicant: Edge Homes; Grant Allen, Presenter

Mr. Allen introduced the three related applications submitted by Edge Homes, pertaining to approximately 16.5 acres located at several addresses along 5400 South (the site of the former Kmart building), which had since been demolished. The applications together sought to: amend the General Plan Future Land Use Map from Mixed-Use High Intensity to Residential High Density; repeal the existing SSD-X West Point zoning ordinance (Chapter 13.42), which had been created for the previously approved "Volta" apartment project; and enact a new SSD-R zoning district called "Solstice at 54th" (Chapter 13.43) with a corresponding zoning map amendment.

Mr. Allen clarified that the Commission was not being asked to make a recommendation at this hearing. Rather, this was a conceptual work session to provide the applicant with substantive feedback on their concept development plan, with the understanding that the applications would be continued to a future meeting. Public comment was nonetheless invited and encouraged.

Mr. Allen walked through the major elements of the staff analysis, organized around open space, street and streetscape design, architecture and site design, and fencing and buffering. Staff had identified several areas requiring further detail or clarification as the project advanced, including the need for a defined open space percentage standard, cross-sections of proposed private roadways and sidewalks, a landscaping plan, and a clearer representation of the southern buffer between the development and the adjacent residential neighborhood. Mr. Allen referenced the Traditional Neighborhood Overlay Zone's 15% open space minimum and the Taylor Villas precedent of 40% as reference points, noting the city's code did not currently define "usable open space" for SSD (specific site development) districts. Staff also flagged that the applicant's concept plan showed a stub road connection to the southern residential neighborhood that the applicant had proposed to leave disconnected — a deviation from the city's connectivity requirements that would need to be addressed in the final ordinance. Regarding parking, there would be four spaces per unit—two in the garage and another two in the driveway. Some condominium units would only have two spaces, but with guest parking scattered throughout the site, plans included a total of 1,199 parking spaces.

He explained that staff and the developer sought input regarding the various project elements and Commissioner Muñoz reminded her colleagues to focus their feedback on what was allowed by city code rather than their personal preferences.

Applicant Paxton Guymon of Edge Homes then addressed the Planning Commission. He emphasized the significant differences between the proposed Solstice at 54th development and the previously approved Volta apartment project. The Volta project had been approved for 647 rental units at a density of approximately 39 units per acre, with building heights permitted up to 110' under the existing SSD ordinance. The Edge Homes proposal called for 316 for-sale units — a mix of 70 condominiums and 246 townhomes of varied types — at a density of approximately 19.15 units per acre. The tallest proposed buildings were four-story condominiums located along 5400 South, with three-story townhomes occupying the interior and southern portions of the site. The applicant committed to height maximums of 45' for townhomes and 60' for condominiums. He noted that the site was substantially flat and that all units would be slab-on-grade with no basements, avoiding the significant mass excavation and fill that often raised effective building heights in comparable projects.

Mr. Guymon outlined the project's affordability component, describing a proposed partnership with the city's Redevelopment Agency under which Edge Homes and the city would each contribute \$30,000 toward the purchase price of 20 price-restricted units, providing buyers with an effective \$60,000 discount — bringing condominiums priced at approximately \$325,000 to \$350,000 down to approximately \$275,000 for eligible buyers. He cited a similar program successfully executed at the Taylor Villas project in Taylorsville. He also proposed recorded Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and development agreement provisions restricting the percentage of units that could ever be rented to no

more than 20% at any time, with the city retaining consent rights over any future amendment to that restriction. He added that neither Edge Homes nor any institutional investor would retain units as rentals. Mr. Guymon felt confident in committing 15% of the project to usable open space but admitted it was unclear what type of areas could be included in that calculation.

Commissioner McElreath inquired about the buffering to the south of the project. Mr. Guymon indicated there would be a variety of buffers in place, including an existing concrete wall which would need to be beautified. He mentioned that neighbors did not want a connection with a stub road. Also, the Homeowner's Association would be paying into a reserve account to preserve and maintain the private roads, so it made sense to reserve those roads for private rather than public use.

Commissioner McElreath also asked about whether or not the 20% limit on rentals was enforceable. Mr. Guymon indicated it would be. The restrictions would be included in the recorded documents and would indicate that the provisions could not be amended without the city's approval. The provisions would be included in the development agreement as well, and potential buyers would be made aware of the restrictions through very specific seller disclosures.

Ms. Blaes pointed out that because this project was located within a redevelopment area, the area collected tax increment and instead of that going to the general fund of the various taxing entities, it would be held for use in that geographic area. The 20% housing set-aside was a requirement and there would likely be a developer participation agreement (in addition to the development agreement) requiring that no more than 20% of the units could be rentals.

Chair Young wondered if it would be possible to prohibit renting for the first year after purchase. Mr. Guymon had not considered that but said he was open to discussing it further.

Commissioner Muñoz commented that Taylor Villas (also an Edge Homes project) was very attractive, and she appreciated that it appeared to have been built as promised. She said that 20 affordable units came to about 6% of the total and she would prefer to see that number closer to 10%. Mr. Guymon said he would do that if the city could commit to providing the \$30,000 subsidy for that many units. He pointed out that the program had been quite successful at Taylor Villas.

Commission members engaged in substantive discussion on a range of issues. Commissioner Willardson encouraged the applicant to explore xeriscape or drought-tolerant landscaping alternatives to reduce water consumption, particularly for perimeter

landscaping. Commissioner Wright advocated for stronger pedestrian connectivity within the southern portions of the development, suggesting that trails or clear pedestrian routes from interior units toward the eastern easement area would significantly improve livability for residents who might feel enclosed. He also asked about the city's interest in homeownership versus rental and received confirmation from Chief of Strategic Engagement Dina Blaes that homeownership was far preferable from the city's perspective given its goals for workforce housing, school stability, and the housing-jobs balance.

Commissioner Wright felt that more could be done with the site plans. He was looking for more trees and meaningful walkways and trails within the development, particularly towards the southern end.

Chair Young opened the public hearing.

Clint Smith said that the existing wall mentioned earlier was only six feet high. He felt it would be unconscionable to build a 45' building only 10' from single-family homes.

John Anderson agreed that the wall needed to be higher, although he liked this much better than the Volta project. He mentioned pollution from traffic on Bangerter and said those living on the west side felt like the lost stepchildren of Taylorsville. He hoped for increased police presence in the future. He said he and his neighbors were concerned about all the water and electricity this project would consume and also felt his neighborhood needed a sound wall and more businesses.

Harvey Mathis said he had heard many good things in this presentation although he was disappointed in the 10' buffer zone on the south side.

Madison Smith said this was right in her backyard, and she wondered if existing infrastructure could support it. Effective urban planning was not only about density. Quality of redevelopment was also crucial. Homeownership was generally positive, but it was not the only pertinent issue. Is this compatible w/ the surrounding neighborhood?

Carla (unknown last name) said the proposed buildings would be right in her backyard and that she was speaking on behalf of several neighbors. Hundreds of additional vehicles would affect safety of neighborhood children. She was concerned about sewer capacity and other city infrastructure, the lack of privacy in their yards, and constant pollution and commercial noise. She felt the 10' buffer was insufficient and wanted height restricted to two stories.

Dana Anderson had heard rumors that the ground at this site could not sustain these buildings, and that a well would be necessary in order to obtain water services. What about sewer services? She wanted the existing wall to be higher to increase privacy and

complained of both sound and air pollution from Bangerter Highway. Although she realized there was a housing shortage, she felt there was a greater need for commercial development here. Chair Young suggested she take her concerns regarding economic development to Mayor Overson and development staff.

William Lott's property bordered the south side of the subject property and pointed out that there were already 124 rental units near him in 3-story units. This proposal would increase that number to more than 180 rental units in the neighborhood. He was concerned about an even greater lack of privacy.

Joseph Knorr's primary concern was about the increase in traffic expected with this project.

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

In response to some of the concerns, Ms. Blaes pointed out that because this project was in a redevelopment area, city staff were already in discussions to figure out how to make this a more apparent gateway to Taylorsville with increased amenities. Additionally, the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) was conducting a corridor study with Kearns to address area improvements. She encouraged interested parties to attend future meetings of the Taylorsville Redevelopment Agency Board.

At approximately 10:19 p.m., Commissioner McElreath pointed out the lateness of the hour, and asked that the meeting adjourn by 10:30 p.m.

Mr. Guymon said he would study the issue regarding the 10' setback to see if there was a way to increase it and/or increase the height of the existing wall. Regarding the possibility of installing a soundwall along Bangerter Highway, he was in complete agreement that one was needed. However, it was not allowed due to a Jordan Aqueduct easement at that location. He still hoped to negotiate a way around that with the Jordan Water Conservancy District. He agreed with Ms. Smith's comments regarding the importance of ensuring sufficient infrastructure was in place. He said these issues were being closely considered, and he was confident that solutions would be found. He said that water service was not a problem and that this project would be much better for the community than Volta would have been.

Mr. Allen wondered if Mr. Guymon would consider matching the existing 45' height restriction as an additional buffer on the south side. He said city staff also had some additional ideas for the easement area with respect to amenities.

Commissioner Wilkey asked whether there would be sufficient room for pickup trucks to be parked at these units. Mr. Guymon pointed out that extended cab trucks would not be ideal

for units with shorter driveways. There would be trade-offs as there were anywhere, and it was more important to him to provide 3.7 parking spaces per unit than it was to provide longer driveways. Chair Young pointed out that was more parking than city code required. He asked if there would be a traffic study. Mr. Guymon responded that could be conducted if the city needed one, but that the traffic impact would be significantly lower than what would have resulted from the previously proposed 647-unit project.

Commissioner Wilkey asked how much the HOA dues were estimated to be. Mr. Guymon responded that his goal was to start at \$100 or less, but that it depended on whether or not internet service would be included.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. However, Ms. Blaes pointed out that staff first needed a motion on the Solstice on 54th applications, perhaps to continue them to a future meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to continue Files 1GP26, 5Z26 and 6Z26 to a future Planning Commission meeting to address the concerns brought forth tonight. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkey. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:26 p.m.


Jamie Brooks, MMC
City Recorder



