City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
September 22, 2026
Briefing – 6pm / Regular Session – 6:30 pm
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance-

Planning Commission	**Staff**
David Young, Chair	Dina Blaes
B. Murphy (Alternate)	Grant Allen, Senior Planner
Don Russell	Terryne Bergeson, Planner
Cindy Wilkey	Jamie Brooks, City Recorder
David Wright	

Others Present: Sophie Bellina and Bob Knudsen

Excused: Commissioners Marc McElreath, Barbara Muñoz and Gordon Willardson

BRIEFING SESSION – 6 PM

Chair Young called the briefing session to order at 6:03 p.m. Commissioners McElreath, Muñoz and Willardson were not in attendance.

1. To Be Determined

Senior Planner Grant Allen updated the commissioners on annual training requirements and opportunities. He asked Commissioner Russell to share some highlights of the training he had recently attended when they met the following month.

2. City Council Meeting Discussion

Commissioner Russell reported on the City Council meeting held on September 2, 2026, commenting on the stark difference between how that body viewed the Summit Vista application and how the Planning Commission viewed it. Chief of Strategic Engagement Dina Blaes encouraged the rest of the Commission to listen to the audio recording of the City Council meeting for full context of the discussion.

Commissioner Wright then reviewed the September 16, 2026 City Council meeting.

Commissioner McElreath had been assigned to attend the October 7th meeting and report back, while Commissioner Willardson was to do so for the October 21st meeting. Chair Young asked Allen to reach out to each since neither was in attendance.

DRAFT

GENERAL MEETING – 6:30 PM

Chair Young called the general meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and read a statement explaining the Planning Commission's role.

***Consent Agenda**:*

3. Approve Minutes from August 25, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to approve the minutes of the August 25, 2026 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Russell and passed with Commissioners Murphy, Wright, Young and Russell voting in favor of the motion. Commissioner Wilkey abstained as she had not been present for the August 25th meeting.

Main Agenda:

4. Public Hearing and Recommendation to the City Council for a Zoning Text Amendment to Title 13.11.010 of the Taylorsville Municipal Code, Amending 13.11.010 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Guesthouses to Add Detached Accessory Dwelling Units.

File: 8Z26-DCA-000633-2026
Applicant: City of Taylorsville
Location: Citywide Applicability
Presenter: Grant Allen, AICP – Senior Planner

Allen presented the zoning text amendment, which had been continued from the prior meeting. He recapped the background, noting that the 2026 Utah legislative session adopted Senate Bill 284, requiring cities to allow detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs) on lots of 11,000 square feet or larger. The proposed amendment to Title 13.11.010 would add a new section governing DADUs alongside the existing internal ADU standards and would also address subsection units. Allen indicated that staff, in collaboration with a consulting team at Kimley Horn, had drafted updated text and new illustrative graphics based on prior work sessions and commissioner feedback. He presented three updated dimensional diagrams covering corner lots, interior lots, and irregular or cul-de-sac lots.

Consultant Sophie Bellina explained an elevation diagram illustrating the proposed height-to-separation ratio. She indicated that the minimum separation between the primary dwelling and the DADU would begin at six feet when the DADU was at or below the height of the primary dwelling and would increase by two feet for every additional foot of DADU height above the primary dwelling. This provision was intended to prevent an

DRAFT

unreasonably tall structure from being built in very close proximity to the primary residence.

Commissioners discussed at length the appropriateness of the height-to-separation ratio. Some commissioners questioned the rationale for requiring increased separation for taller DADUs, noting that property owners were making choices on their own land and could exercise their own judgment. Others indicated the ratio was a reasonable tool for maintaining livability and visual scale. The Commission ultimately reached consensus to retain the height-to-separation ratio as proposed in the draft.

A discussion was also held regarding the proposed rear yard setback of fifteen feet for DADUs. Planner Terryne Bergeson raised the concern that several of the city's larger residential zones — specifically R-1-40, R-1-30, R-1-20, and R-1-15 — required a thirty-foot rear setback for primary dwellings and questioned whether the DADU setback should be calibrated to the underlying zone rather than a uniform fifteen feet. The Commission discussed the potential that a thirty-foot setback in larger zones could effectively eliminate many lots from being able to accommodate a DADU at all. It was ultimately noted that because DADUs were accessory structures and generally smaller than primary dwellings, retaining the uniform fifteen-foot rear setback was a defensible and pragmatic approach, particularly for this first phase of implementation. The Commission reached consensus to retain the fifteen-foot rear setback as drafted.

Commissioners reviewed the proposed side yard setback of fifteen feet for DADUs and noted it was more generous to neighbors than the minimum side yard setbacks currently permitted for primary dwellings. No changes were proposed to the side yard setback standard.

The Commission then turned to the lot coverage provision, which as drafted required that the combined lot coverage of all structures and impervious surfaces — including the primary dwelling, DADU, driveways, walkways, and patios — not exceed 25% of the lot. Several commissioners found this standard overly restrictive, noting that the footprint of many existing primary dwellings would already approach or exceed that threshold on their own. After discussion, the Commission recommended striking the lot coverage provision entirely from the DADU table, deferring instead to the city's existing impervious surface and detached structure standards, which were already reflected in separate sections of code.

Commissioners also discussed and revised the size limitation for DADUs. The draft had included, as a universal standard applicable to all ADUs, a provision that the ADU could not exceed 50% of the total square footage of the primary dwelling. Staff clarified that state law prohibited cities from placing size restrictions on internal ADUs, meaning that provision could not lawfully remain in the universal standards section. The Commission agreed to remove the size restriction from the universal section and relocate it to the DADU-specific section, where state law permitted such restrictions. After deliberation, the Commission agreed that a DADU should not exceed 50% of the square footage of the

DRAFT

primary dwelling's footprint, nor 75% of the total square footage of the primary dwelling — whichever was more restrictive — in order to ensure that the DADU remained genuinely secondary and incidental to the primary structure.

Additional provisions discussed and affirmed by the Commission included: the prohibition on a separate utility meter for DADUs (consistent with the existing standard for internal ADUs and at the direction of Taylorsville Bennion Improvement District); the requirement that DADU applicants maintain an active rental business license, with new owners required to obtain reauthorization upon sale of the property; the prohibition on short-term rentals of fewer than ninety consecutive days, consistent with state law for DADUs; the requirement that DADUs comply with all applicable building, health, and fire codes including fire access requirements; and the requirement that DADUs be designed compatibly with the primary dwelling and include fully shielded, downward-directed exterior lighting.

The Commission also affirmed that the existing guesthouse provisions in the code would be stricken entirely, with any future guesthouse construction to be processed under the new DADU standards. Allen noted that approximately five existing guesthouses would be addressed through the enforcement and permit process as opportunities arise.

Allen walked commissioners through the permit documentation requirements, the updated definitions for accessory dwelling unit, internal ADU, detached ADU, owner occupancy, primary dwelling, and primary residence, and the proposed updates to the permitted land use tables. Internal ADUs and DADUs were proposed as permitted uses in all single-family residential zones and as administrative conditional uses in mixed-use zones. The parking section was updated to require a minimum of one dedicated off-street parking space for the exclusive use of the ADU occupant, in addition to the two off-street spaces and two-car garage required for the primary dwelling.

Allen noted that certain provisions referencing Title 5 (Business Licensing) would be further aligned through a pending Title 5 rewrite, which staff anticipated bringing forward within approximately three months.

Allen confirmed that the public hearing had been continued from the prior meeting. Chair Young opened the public hearing, but there were no members of the public physically present to speak and no one online who expressed a desire to do so. The Chair then closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for File #8Z26-DCA-000633-2026 with the following three changes: 1) to remove the lot coverage section from the table; 2) to eliminate universal item #5 in the ADU; and 3) to include the DADU size restrictions "not to exceed 50% of the square footage of the footprint and 75% of the square footage of the total dwelling unit." The motion was seconded by Commissioner B. Murphy and passed unanimously.

DRAFT

Adjournment:

MOTION: Commissioner Wright moved to adjourn.

Before a vote could be taken, Commissioner Wilkey returned to an earlier topic and expressed concern about the significant divergence between the Planning Commission's unanimous denial and the City Council's unanimous approval of the Summit Vista application and asked whether a mechanism could be established to improve communication and alignment between the two bodies. The chair encouraged individual commissioners to reach out to their respective council representatives as private citizens rather than as a collective body, in order to avoid an adversarial posture. Commissioner Wright felt it might be helpful to have the City Council address the Planning Commission and share their perspective.

Commissioner Wright left the meeting at 8:40 due to a previous commitment.

Blaes acknowledged the commissioners' concern and indicated that she would work with the legal department to explore an appropriate forum for the two bodies to share perspectives generally — without revisiting the specifics of a particular application — and to ensure that both the Planning Commission and the City Council were operating with a shared understanding of goals and objectives. The Commission expressed general agreement with allowing staff time to work through that process.

The meeting adjourned at 8:44 pm

_____
Jamie Brooks, MMC
City Recorder

Meeting Minutes Prepared with the Aid of HeyGov Artificial Intelligence

DRAFT