

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
August 25, 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
Don Russell
Gordon Willardson
David Wright

Staff

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Ernest Burgess, Robert Knudsen, and F. Dixon Nahrwold

EXCUSED: Commissioner Cindy Wilkey

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

1. To Be Determined

Vice Chair Muñoz began the briefing session at 6:01 p.m., explaining that Chair Young was stuck in traffic.

Senior Planner Grant Allen explained that information regarding future training opportunities would be brought forth at a future meeting.

2. City Council Meeting Discussion

Commissioner Murphy reported on the August 19, 2026 meeting of the City Council, after which Commissioners Russell and Wright agreed to report back on the September 2nd and 16th meetings once they took place. Commissioner Russell would view his assigned meet via livestream as he would be out of town.

Chair Young arrived and the briefing session adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 P.M.

Chair Young called the general meeting to order and provided a brief orientation for the public, outlining the Planning Commission's role as a citizen board responsible for making

recommendations to the City Council on zoning matters and approving conditional uses and subdivisions. He noted that decisions were grounded in the general plan, staff recommendations, and public testimony, and reminded those in attendance to silence mobile devices and observe the two-minute public comment limit.

Consent Agenda

3. Approve Minutes from the August 11, 2026 Planning Commission meeting

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to approve the minutes from the August 11, 2026 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Willardson and passed unanimously.

Main Agenda

4. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Text Amendment to Taylorsville Municipal Code Section 13.11.040, Related to the Use of Detached Accessory Structures for Home Occupations; File No. 2226-DCA-000581-2026; Dixon Nahrwold, applicant; Terryne Bergeson, Presenter.

Planner Terryne Bergeson presented the proposed zoning text amendment, which sought to allow home occupations to operate out of detached accessory structures, such as garages or sheds. She explained that existing code restricted home occupations entirely to the interior of the primary dwelling, excluding garages and accessory buildings. The applicant, Dixon Nahrwold, had initiated the request after constructing a greenhouse on his property with the intent of running a small plant-selling business from it.

Bergeson reviewed the existing home occupation standards, which included operational limitations requiring the business to remain incidental to residential use, restrictions on exterior appearance, delivery limitations, hours of operation requirements, and a prohibition on off-site employees. She noted that a list of sixteen specifically prohibited high-impact home occupation types—such as automobile repair and cabinetry making—would remain unchanged under the proposal. A comparison of neighboring municipalities showed that several, including West Jordan, Mill Creek, Sandy, Midvale, and Orem, already permitted home occupations in detached accessory structures, while Murray and West Valley did not.

The proposed amendment would add a new subsection to the code allowing home occupations to operate in a detached accessory structure, subject to the condition that the structure did not exceed 1,000 square feet or more than 50 percent of the main dwelling's footprint, whichever was less. The structure would also be required to comply with existing setback and height standards, be subject to building health and fire code review, and maintain required residential parking. Residential daycares and microschools

would remain restricted to the primary dwelling only, given their higher traffic and noise implications.

Commissioner Murphy inquired about enforcement, and Bergeson explained that home occupation applicants provided a brief business description at the time of licensing, code enforcement conducted an annual exterior inspection, and any outstanding code violations must be resolved before a license was renewed.

Nahrwold addressed the Commission briefly, describing his intent to sell annual food crops such as tomatoes and greens to neighbors and framing the project as a small-scale community-oriented endeavor.

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

During Commission discussion, Commissioner Gordon Willardson expressed concern that the amendment would open the door to broader commercial activity in residential neighborhoods and place additional burdens on code enforcement. He maintained that businesses that outgrew a home should be conducted from a commercial property. Chair Young acknowledged this perspective but asked the Commission to evaluate the amendment on a citywide basis rather than focusing solely on the applicant's situation. Senior Planner Grant Allen noted that the existing accessory structure size regulations would independently limit the scale of any such structures, and Bergeson clarified that the 1,000 square foot cap applied to the total size of the qualifying structure, not merely the portion used for business, which would prevent large barns or outbuildings from qualifying.

Commissioner McElreath confirmed with Bergeson that the list of prohibited home occupation types would remain entirely intact under the proposed amendment. Commissioner Muñoz further observed that the amendment was similar in scope to the detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) discussions underway, noting that the number of restrictions on lot size, setbacks, and access would naturally limit widespread uptake.

MOTION: Commissioner McElreath moved to send a positive recommendation to the City Council for File No. 2226-DCA-000581-2026 to amend Taylorsville Municipal Code Section 13.11.040, related to the use of detached accessory structures for home occupations, based on the information and findings in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Muñoz and passed 6-1 with Commissioner Willardson voting no.

5. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Text Amendment to Title 13.11.010 of the Taylorsville Municipal Code, Amending 13.11.040 Related to the Use of Detached Accessory Structures for Home Occupations; File No. 8Z26-DCA-000633-2026; City of Taylorsville, applicant; Grant Allen, presenter.

Grant Allen presented a draft zoning text amendment to add detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs) to the Taylorsville Municipal Code, as required under 2026 state legislation (Senate Bill 284), which mandated that municipalities permit DADUs on single-family lots of 11,000 square feet or larger where single-family dwellings were a permitted use. Allen noted that two prior work sessions had been held in April and June, and that staff had subsequently worked with outside consultants to synthesize commission feedback and research into the current draft.

Allen walked the Commission through the proposed text, which included clarified definitions for accessory dwelling units (distinguishing internal from detached), a definition for legally constructed accessory structures eligible for conversion to a DADU, and clarifications on owner occupancy and primary dwelling terminology. The draft proposed adding DADU as a permitted use in all residential zones, while excluding it from residential multifamily, MH (manufactured home), commercial, industrial, professional office, transit corridor, and research and development zones, with staff also proposing to remove it from the mixed-use zone in the next revision.

Chief of Strategic Engagement Dina Blaes interjected regarding a significant drafting challenge: inconsistencies in the nomenclature between state code and Taylorsville's existing code—particularly in terms such as "primary dwelling," "primary residence," and "primary use"—which had not yet been fully reconciled. She acknowledged this was a known issue being discussed across the Utah League of Cities and Towns, with further state code clarifications anticipated in the next legislative session.

Chair Young asked about the requirement that if rented, such units could not be rented for fewer than 30 days. Blaes responded that it was meant to accommodate state code regarding month-to-month leases. The Chair expressed concern that it provided an avenue for some to circumvent the prohibition against short-term rentals such as those coordinated through Airbnb.

The draft proposed a standards table for DADUs addressing location, setbacks, primary dwelling separation, height, and parking. Blaes pointed out how helpful it would be for the commissioners to not be quiet but instead, weigh in with their opinions on the following key discussion points:

Basements

Allen noted the current draft retained a prohibition carried over from the guesthouse code, but staff did not see a policy justification for the restriction. The Commission did not express opposition to allowing basements, and Chair Young acknowledged that doing so could reduce the need for taller above-grade structures.

Parking

Commissioner McElreath wondered if allowing basements would lead to increased parking issues. Blaes read directly from state code, confirming the city could require no more than two off-site parking spaces for DADUs of 650 square feet or larger, and no more than one for smaller units. The Commission generally supported requiring the maximum allowable two spaces for larger DADUs.

Setbacks

Staff proposed a 15-foot minimum side and rear setback for DADUs, which generated some debate. Chair Young questioned whether this side setback standard was unnecessarily greater than those permitted for the primary residence or existing guesthouses, while Commissioner McElreath argued the greater separation was warranted given that a DADU introduced additional residents and activity.

Location

The Commission generally supported allowing DADUs in rear yards or side yards, provided the front wall plane of the DADU did not extend forward of the midpoint of the primary dwelling's secondary facade, ensuring the primary residence retained visual prominence.

Primary Dwelling Separation

The Commission affirmed the proposed 6-foot minimum separation between the rear wall plane of the primary dwelling and the front wall plane of the DADU, consistent with the existing accessory structure separation standard in the code.

Height

Staff proposed removing the "single story" language, as the term lacked a precise definition in the city's code and posed challenges for structures such as split-levels. In its place, staff proposed a height-to-separation ratio: for every one foot that the DADU's roofline exceeded that of the primary dwelling, an additional two feet of separation from the primary dwelling would be required. Chair Young and Commissioner Wright expressed reservations about this formula. Bergeson noted that a similar height-to-setback ratio had been applied in the Summit Vista text amendment to protect neighbor privacy and suggested a 1-to-1 ratio as a more reasonable compromise. The Commission appeared to broadly support a 1-to-1 ratio, and staff indicated this would be refined in the next draft.

Maximum Footprint and Bedrooms

The draft proposed limiting the DADU to no more than 75% of the primary dwelling's footprint, and no more than one bedroom, language carried from the guesthouse section. The Commission supported relaxing the bedroom limitation to two, particularly in light of allowing basements, which would meaningfully increase usable square footage. The 75% footprint cap was broadly accepted as reasonable.

Throughout the discussion, Commissioner Willardson urged staff to make the standards as restrictive as legally permissible to protect existing homeowners. Chair Young offered

a contrasting perspective, emphasizing that DADUs could provide meaningful housing affordability tools, including allowing owners to move into a smaller accessory unit and rent the primary home. Both perspectives were acknowledged as representing the range of views on the Commission, with Commissioner Muñoz characterizing the goal as finding a workable middle ground.

There was then a discussion regarding the fact that this was still a preliminary discussion, and the planning commission was not yet being asked to approve anything.

Staff requested that commissioners review a red-lined draft Word document and submit written comments or questions by close of business on September 2, 2026, to allow a consultant meeting to proceed the following day. Commissioners indicated their willingness to do so.

Owner Occupancy

Blaes confirmed that state code permitted the city to require that the parcel be owner-occupied, with the owner residing in either the primary dwelling or the DADU, and the Commission indicated support for this requirement.

Chair Young opened the public hearing. However, there was no one in person or online who expressed a desire to speak, so the Chair

MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to continue File No. 8Z26-DCA-000633-2026 to the 9-22-2026 Planning Commission Meeting to allow the commissioners time to provide feedback regarding the draft proposal (Exhibit A) and for staff to meet with consultants on the matter. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell and passed unanimously.

Adjournment

MOTION: Commissioner Muñoz moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wright and passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Jamie Brooks, MMC
City Recorder

These minutes prepared with the aid of HeyGov Clerk Minutes