

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2021
Work Session – 6:30 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Marc McElreath – Chairman
Kent Burggraaf - Vice Chairman
Don Quigley
David Wright
Lynette Wendel
Gordon Willardson
Don Russell (Alternate)

Community Development Staff

Wayne Harper - Director
Jim Spung – Senior Planner
Karyn Kerdolff- GIS Planner
Stephanie Shelman – Deputy City Attorney
Jean Gallegos – Admin Assistant/Recorder

PRESENT: David Young, Ernest Burgess

WORK SESSION – 6:30 P.M.

Chairman McElreath opened the meeting and advised the item on the agenda, File #14Z20, Discussion of Land Development Code Update, was for discussion only this evening, and turned the time over to Jim Spung/Senior Planner for presentation.

1. **Mr. Spung**  said he would welcome any questions Commissioners had during his presentation. He advised this was first presented back in November 2020, when Staff started working on this project. They are working on comprehensive updates to the Code to modernize it and make it work better. The report being presented this evening is the Assessment Report Staff prepared to provide an outline or road map for actually drafting the Code. It includes specific recommendations Staff has and things that should be improved. He added that the document captures a lot of the big ideas and principles so that when Staff begins drafting the final document it will not be a surprise to anyone what is contained therein.  He gave a quick overview of the project, reviewing the goals established early on which are: Streamline development review procedures and increase predictability of land use decisions; Consider the needs of the City both now and in the future; Align the Code with General Plan and Utah State Statutes; (4) Enable great design and a diverse mix of land uses; (5) Improve user-friendliness through logical structure, graphics, tables, and illustrations.

He reviewed the project time-line to be: Fall 2020 – Project Orientation; Winter 2020 – LDC assessment and outline; Presently it is at the Administration & Procedures segment, zoning districts and uses, and development and design standards. Winter 2020 through Summer 2021 – Prepare the draft LDC; Fall 2021 – LDC Adoption. **Mr. Spung** said the City's website contains many important details to anyone wishing to give input.

Mr. Spung outlined some of the more finely defined goals as being: Create a more user-friendly code; fine-tune the zoning districts; reorganize and strengthen use regulations; improve and tailor development standards; and simplify the development review procedures.

1. **Create a more user-friendly Code:** When it is done, it will be much easier for the public to find exactly what they are looking for in the new Land Development Code. A great help in that arena will be to add

more graphics and illustrations. **Commissioner Burggraaf** asked if when people are using the diagrams, etc., so they can better comprehend what the Code is requiring, would that be in a format where they can access it through the City Website?  **Mr. Spung** said that would be the case in the codified version.

He said that Staff would work with the codifiers and there will also be a PDF version of the Code on-line on the Land Development Code home page, so people can access it via the PDF or the codified version.

 **Commissioner Burggraaf** said the reason he asked that was sometimes the diagrams in certain City's codes can't be included in the codified versions. **Mr. Spung** said that in general the codifiers have lately been doing better jobs at that because more cities are moving to a more graphic style code. That Staff would work to assure that the codifiers can use everything and if they can't, make sure it is modified so that they can.

2. The next topic for discussion was **"Fine Tuning the Zoning Districts"**. The zoning districts are displayed on the City Zoning Map and lay the ground-work for what can and cannot be done on a specific property.

 That is the list of land uses allowed to have in specific areas and the number of zoning districts is important because that is how the City will develop. If everything is zoned residential, everything will develop residential. The "toolbox" is a little outdated and doesn't really reflect the General Plan in a vision for what Taylorsville wants to become.

- The big part of this project is going to be aligning the menu of zoning districts available, with the General Plan. The General Plan has different land use categories, some of which include high density residential, medium density residential, mixed use, office, business park, etc. There are many different types of land uses and he did not feel the current code presents a great tool for the development community to really build the types of places that the City wants.
- Staff is not proposing any substantial changes to existing zoning as part of this project, it is more or less a clean-up effort to remove unnecessary districts that perhaps are not really used, adjust current district standards and introduce new zoning districts that maybe there are not currently that would help implement some of the types of development which are not acceptable.
- He gave examples: Some of the districts may be re-named to something that makes more sense, i.e., "professional office" and "research and development" are two separate districts right now and might be consolidated and renamed to "employment district", so that it is broader and not having to have a specific district for two separate uses that could fall under one.
- Again, to consolidate similar districts such as "neighborhood commercial" and "limited commercial" districts. Those in essence are very similar and could be consolidated into a "commercial neighborhood" type district.
- The report also talks about creating new zoning districts that are not currently being used. There was a "mixed-use" district, but it is very one-dimensional, and Staff proposes breaking that up into different scales of mixed use, more of a neighborhood mixed use district, a transitional, which would be more moderate to medium density or scale, and then a regional mixed use which would be more of a transit-oriented development type district. 
- The menu of zoning districts should be aligned to accommodate General Plan identified unique place types and fine tune the zoning districts.

3. **Commissioner Wright**  commented that with regards to zoning districts, looking at residential districts and how those are proposed, Staff has things in the higher density areas with designation for up

to multi-housing 12 and 16 units in various districts that were there. Now the proposal is to condense those apparently. His question with regards to that was when the Commission was looking at some of the developments that have been reviewed, the Commission was given somewhat of a tool in having those different sizes there. One of the developments that came in, the Commission was concerned about because it didn't have large enough parking stalls and the feel was that there were too many units being proposed. It seems like there would be a loss of some of the ability to put a stamp of approval on something like that if those districts were consolidated into one high density district. **Mr. Spung** advised that this report has included at the end of the zoning districts section a preliminary table with some recommendations about where districts could be consolidated or eliminated or where new districts could be implemented. A lot of the consolidations in the residential piece (multi-family). **Commissioner Wright** said that in the proposed high density residential there is residential multi-family 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 16 and if that is changed to just high density, the opportunity is lost to avoid a condition that may not be ideal. **Mr. Spung** said that was a great point, which will be discussed further along in the presentation under size and scale of projects.  There will still be content within a zoning district, things that will regulate how big something can be.

4. **Mr. Spung** then addressed **Community Facilities District**, which would be new. A lot of communities adopt zoning districts specifically for parks, schools, churches, city hall, fire stations and police stations. Things that don't really fit in a commercial or industrial zone and are not residential but a very unique type of land use. Staff is proposing to adopt something like "utility stations", to help provide some predictability to the City to say these are area designations for these types of uses.
5. **Mr. Spung** introduced another slide he felt the Commissioners would be very involved with, that being **"Reconciling the New Land Development Code with the Zoning Map"**. Currently there is an adopted zoning map in the City and if district names are changed or consolidation of districts, then that needs to be reflected on the map that the City enforces. That is an essential way to keep the citizens informed.
 - 5.1 With updating the zoning districts, that will eventually have to translate to the map, which involves two different steps in so doing: The first step is conversion of map, which is basically taking the current zoning today and converting that map to the most closely resembling district in the new Code. For example, if Professional Office and Research and Development Districts are consolidated into an Employment District, everything that is Professional Office and Research, and Development would just change to Employment on the new map. It would just be a name change, not redrawing boundaries or changing colors, just renaming and converting. This first step must be completed prior to the effective date of the new Code.
 - 5.2 The second step is for substantive changes, which gets a little more challenging because this is where the City can step back and figure out if the zoning area designations should be changed for the City. An example would be if a new mixed-use zoning district that is not currently in use, did the City want to apply those on the map. That would be changing the zoning from whatever it is now to something different which requires more analysis and discussion. That is the reason why Staff is recommending doing this in two stages – the conversion and then consulting the General Plan in making recommendations for re-zonings. 
 - 5.3 **Commissioner Burggraaf** said that he assumed when the second stage is reached Staff, would be talking through potential re-zones with the Legal Department to determine if there are any issues or if someone wants to contest re-zoning for the new LDC. **Mr. Spung** said in the report it summarizes in the Mapping Section a few different options the City can take with that. Some cities are saying they know what they want to do, they have a General Plan and a vision and are just going to rezone properties without caring if anyone likes it or not. He added that is not the most popular of the options, but it is an option. Another option is an "opt-in" approach where

the City contacts property owners saying there is a new Code with new tools, this is what we think this property should become in the future. If the property owner is on-board with the vision, they can “opt-in” and the City will rezone the property for them. The other option is an “opt-out” where the City says they are rezoning properties and asks that the property owners voice their opinion, otherwise, that it will be rezoned as proposed.  Or the city could just do nothing and do re-zones as proposals are received for development. Just a matter of how proactive the City wants to be in implementing the vision. **Commissioner Burggraaf** said it seems that if the City is going to all the effort in developing a new city-wide Code it almost has to go with what was termed as the “unpopular” approach to be most effective. **Mr. Spung** said that could be right, but it is up to the City Council to decide. There may be some areas of the City where that is a better approach and other areas where it is not. This project is focusing on making sure that the City has the tools in the zoning code to develop the types of projects the City wants here. **Mr. Spung** said that next month Staff will bring back the zoning map analysis.



6. **Mr. Spung** advised another aspect of this change would be consolidation of the Use Table, which presently is very confusing. Every land use will have a clear definition attached. This change will assure proper uses are allowed in the right zones. There will also be new type uses introduced such as Artisan Manufacturing, Brewery, Distillery and Winery, and Urban Agriculture.  **Commissioner Wendel** asked where those uses would be allowed right now, and **Mr. Spung** said that was still to be determined but they would go wherever it made the most sense.
7. On Affordable Housing, **Commissioner Burggraaf**  asked for clarification reference the term “work force housing”. He considered himself part of the work force and wondered how that was distinguished in this definition. **Mr. Spung** said that everyone uses a different term to be politically acceptable now. Some say work force housing, and some say affordable housing. Generally, the idea is the City annually has to create a moderate-income housing report to be sent to the State of Utah. Taylorsville’s report was forwarded in January 2021. It basically summarizes the number of dwelling units in Taylorsville that meet a certain income bracket for people, which is moderate income housing. Every year when applications are sent to Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in the Federal Government, they send funding for CDGB to fund projects. Every year they ask what the City is doing to remove barriers to affordable housing and what is being done to help people that are disadvantaged in the City. That affordable housing has a stigma attached that it is strictly for low-income clients. The truth is that it is more expensive to rent than to own right now.
8. **Mr. Spung** listed some goals for Staff in updating the Land Development Code as being:
 - To try and make life easier for everybody who is looking through the Code to find a specific topic.
 - Create diversified housing types and remove barriers that prevent development of housing at different price points.
 - Consider new incentives to encourage housing variety in targeted areas.
 - Create use-specific standards.
 - Consolidate all development standards into one chapter and create new development standards as pertinent.
 - Analyze the problems associated with outdoor storage and propose solutions.
 - Organization, purpose, and applicability: Where it is in the LDC, why it is important and when it does apply.
 - Inclusion of a clear purpose statement as to why something is being regulated and exactly what it is.

Example is grading/drainage/landscaping standards in having a purpose statement at the very beginning of that section saying why grading /drainage and landscaping is being regulated would make it clear at the on-set.

- Add a statement for every zoning district which shows what land use should be allowed based on purpose.
-  Building size will impact lot area - create a table to describe what those thresholds are. 
- Focus on Infill & Redevelopment. Generally, update dimensional and development standards to accommodate in-fill and redevelopment: Introduce additional flexibility by adding optional approaches and menus wherever possible. 
- Update Lot & Building Standards allowing that building size and scale are more important than the number of units inside. Density is difficult to visualize, making it ineffective in predicting “how big” something is.
- Current dwelling unit/acre maximums are not calibrated with other standards.
- Building envelope and lot development standards (e.g., setbacks, height limits, lot coverage, parking maximums) are more effective at regulating development form and scale.
- Evaluate parking ratios against national standards.
- Consider creating a maximum parking ratio (e.g., 125% of minimum).
- Strengthen parking alternatives by using shared parking, proximity to transit, senior and affordable housing, on-street parking and obtaining a professional parking study.  Look into modernizing off-street loading by enhancing and coordinating parking area design with other development standards.
- Coordinate landscaping, buffering and fencing requirements.
- Include graphics and illustration in the document.
- Consolidate and reorganize standards.
- Consider neighborhood protection standards.
- Consolidate and strengthen access, circulation, and connectivity standards 
- Update Sign Regulations by reorganizing and simplifying; clarify and define key terms; coordinate sign placement standards with other site and development standards. 
- Remove content-based regulations. Remove references to specific sign types (e.g., memorial signs, menu boards, corporate flags, real estate signs). 

9. Planning Commissioners discussed the proposed changes in depth.

9.1 **Commissioner Burggraaf** said if purpose statements are to be incorporated in this, he wondered if that would qualify that the purpose statements in the specific chapters are not intended as a substantive part of the Code but more as a help to understand the Code. Essentially calling it legislative intent. He was concerned with the broad purpose statement allowing someone to contest it because the Code apparently contradicts itself because the purpose statement does not align with something in the Code content. **Mr. Spung** replied that there will be language in the general provisions chapter that talks about that, but he felt the purpose statements were really helpful for when a developer comes in to request a variance or a modification in that it at least gives the City something they can look at when considering granting a waiver or exception or variance to specific standards does it determine if it stills meet the purpose of why it is being done.

9.2 **Commissioner Wendel** asked for clarification regarding Mr. Spung’s statement regarding adding the statement on what land uses are to be allowed in a district.

9.2.1 **Mr. Spung** advised It is not clear in the Code as to when a developer must comply with different regulations based on what they are building, an example of which he gave as Legacy Plaza, the commercial center on 5400 South and Redwood Road. If they expand one

of their buildings by 50%, basically doubling the size of the building, does that mean they have to improve all the landscaping on the site or just around the building, do they have to upgrade their lighting, re-do their parking lot to comply with State Code. Basically, what are the triggers that a developer must comply with today's Code and not carry forward the non-conforming site features that were there previously. It is a grey area and one that the City can address on a sliding scale, saying that if the building is going to be doubled, the entire site must come into compliance with today's Code. Or they are only adding on 10% expansion of the building the expansion must comply with the Code but everything else on the site doesn't necessarily have to. The solution is to create a table that basically says what those thresholds are so that Staff can know what the expectation is when they develop.

9.2.2 **Mr. Spung** said another thing the Code update will focus on is in-fill and redevelopment. Taylorsville is almost built-out and essentially what will be addressed in the future is in-fill and redevelopment, so having a Code that specifically addresses those challenges is important because people are not buying farm fields and developing subdivisions now. Updating the dimensional and development standards to accommodate these types of projects is important.

9.2.3 **Mr. Spung** added that just as important is having additional flexibility for when something cannot conform to the Code. An example of that would be a narrow lot with overhead power lines and some big easement going through it. There needs to be a way for the Code to allow some flexibility because there would not be enough space to provide 15 trees like the Code requires. So, implementing the tools for that is important as well. Updating the lot and building standards is something that will require a lot of discussion from the Planning Commission and City Council.

9.2.4 This addresses Commissioner Wright's question about the scale and different density of different districts. Generally, it is moving to a more form-based approach, not necessarily a form-based code but rather a form-based way of thinking, like looking at how big a building is (size and scale), which is a better representation about how big something is versus how much density or how many units there are. Density is difficult to visualize, as shown on the image he displayed which showed 75 units per acre density, but which are all very different in the way they are presented and developed.

9.2.5 The new Code is considering removing the terminology "density" altogether. To say the density is fine, the City cares how big it is and what the development standards are with that. Essentially the replacement is establishing a standard which says this is the land use that is allowed on a property, giving the allowed setbacks, maximum height, how much parking is needed, how much landscaping is needed, access location, etc., and then based on all those other factors the developer can determine how many units would then be allowed within those constraints. **Commissioner Wendel** asked for clarification, if Mr. Spung is saying that would be every one of these is 75 units per acre with the same open space same parking. **Mr. Spung** said it would not always be the same open space and parking, but the number of units is the same. **Commissioner Wendel** said she was having difficulty formulating the question how she wanted to and said she would come back to it.



9.3  **Mr. Spung** said there is an RM-12 zone, so there could be a multi-family project with 12 units per acre. Now we can say that multi-family is allowed here, it can be three stories, there must be two parking spaces per unit, there must be a certain amount of landscaping around the edges,

adequate circulation, etc., and then based on that the developer can figure out how many units they can fit in the building. Might be 20 units per acre that they can fit in a three-story building with the required setbacks, circulation, landscaping, etc. There are ways with the use specific standards in the Land Use Table to say if there is a mixed-use neighborhood zoning district and multi-family land uses are allowed there, there can be a cap placed to say, *"In this zoning district you can only have 15 units on the specific site."* That would then limit how big it could be, or you could say it can only be two stories and explain what the setbacks would need to be for that specific land use.

- 9.4 **Parking/Loading.** Mr. Spung said that there was a parking issue in the current table for minimum parking. It is not entirely off of what the national standards are but there are some land uses that could be adjusted to require more parking than other places. In some cases, less parking would be required than in other places. That also will be evaluated in the re-write. He suggested parking alternatives be strengthened through a parking study, such as consideration for shared parking, proximity to transit elements, along with that for senior and affordable housing units. He suggested modernizing off-street loading standards; enhance and coordinate parking area design with other development standards. The plan is to modernize off-street loading standards, and enhance, coordinate parking area design with other development standards.
- 9.5  **Building & Site Design:** The intent is to consolidate and reorganize standards; consider neighborhood protection standards; and refine parking location requirements.  Establish more flexible landscaping and buffering standards.
- 9.6 **Common Review Procedures.** Staff is recommending establishing the following steps be implemented:
- **Pre-application consultation.** Designate appropriate staff for each type of application and bring to light any potential concerns that may be relevant based on the applicant's request (e.g., infrastructure challenges, environmental concerns, etc.).
 - **Application submittal and acceptance.** Establish procedures for reviewing and accepting applications, as well as timelines for when applications expire. Clarify when a project is vested or entitled pursuant to State Statutes.
 - **Staff review and action.** Identify the procedures for reviewing applications, provide for interdepartmental coordination, commenting on applications, and preparing recommendations and investigative reports when applicable.
 - **Public hearing scheduling and notice.** Identify the types of public hearings and the noticing requirements (e.g., published, posted, mailed, website).
 - **Decision-making review and action.** Establish the general procedures for public hearing on development decisions, including public hearings.
 - **Post-decision actions and limitations.** Describe how decisions are posted or presented to applicants and the public, and whether decisions expire. This should also include details on extending expirations or amending previous approvals. 
- 9.7 **Clarify Review & Decision-Making Criteria:** - This project should eliminate all discretionary decisions. and make the development standards clear. Elected officials will set clear, objective standards through an initial legislative review and adoption, and then rely on professional staff to apply those standards fairly and effectively. If an applicant disagrees with a staff decision, they are able to file an appeal to the Hearing Officer. The more objective the standards the greater the opportunity for

staff-level review. This allows elected and appointed officials to focus on big-picture planning issues and other community affairs. It also provides for an expedited review process and more predictability since staff reviews typically do not require a public hearing. Where a waiver or modification is necessary, there should be clear and objective review criteria to support such decision.

- 9.8 **Improve the regulations generally to reduce the need for SSDs:** The development regulations should not only accommodate, but also encourage innovative and creative projects that respond to the Taylorsville General Plan and other area plans, rather than restricting such projects and thus requiring applicants to negotiate. To achieve that goal this project recommends many approaches to help accomplish this goal, a few of which are:

- Authorize minor adjustments to certain standards, like setbacks.
- Update and modernize the current lineup of zone districts and use tables.
- Clearly articulate the level of quality that the City expects to see in all new development.

- 9.9 **Create an Administrative Manual** to house supporting materials outside the Land Development Code. **Commissioner Burggraaf** asked how that Manual would be adopted and changed. **Mr. Spung** said if it is referenced in the Code, it would say, *“Submit an application that is similar to that contained in the Administrative Manual”*. It is adopted as an appendage of the Code. **Commissioner Burggraaf** asked if the City Council eventually eliminates some of those specific parameters as have been discussed as examples and the City is creating an Administrative Manual, what entity or individual is the one with the authority creating and establishing the guidelines that are appropriate in that manual. **Mr. Spung** said that could still be reviewed by the City Council. It is not part of the City Code, but it would be more like standard operating procedures. Once an application is submitted, there will be Staff comments given within 14 days. Staff does not want that in the Code because if that amount of time is not met, then it can be said that the City is not compliant with the City Code. It is more of a guidance document to say, this is what needs to be reviewed and this is how long it will take to review that. **Commissioner Burggraaf** said he recognizes it is meant to give guidance but there will be specific things included in the Administrative Manual. The reason for his question was he wondered if there could be a legal challenge made on some of those specifics in an Administrative Manual with whoever is using that Manual going beyond an elected or appointed authority from the City. However, the City Council is adopting the Manual for “policy” and that may be sufficient to meet the need. He was concerned if it could become a problem, for example when whoever creates the Manual are also the ones who could put in new forms or new information needed without further oversight, which may cause some sort of issue without a stamp of approval from the City Council for instance on a policy standpoint.  Something to consider when creating that Manual is to create a “buck stops here” point at the City Council level. **Mr. Spung** agreed that general language could be included in the Code that says, for instance that a site plan will be required and then for what is needed on the site plan, to see the Administrative Manual for guidance in exactly what is required for that. It is more the details to know exactly what the developer’s expectation is going to be. **Commission Wendel** felt it would be a good tool and it would be nice for it to be appealing based on the projects potentially being done in the City.

- 9.10 **Mr. Spung** said they were finalizing the process for minor or major amendments, he had a question that for instance if someone does do an SSD and when they are submitting building permits, they have an issue that Planning Staff can assist with, would that be considered a minor amendment, or would it have to go back through the Planning Commission to the City Council because it is amending the original approval. As long as the Code addresses saying a minor amendment is listed as these things (list of types), like a setback adjustment of less than 10% from the original site plan or adjusting the parking by a certain percentage from the original approval. Those types of adjustments

are okay to be approved by Staff. Anything bigger than that must go back through the process.  Minor modifications are a new procedure that Staff is looking to implement which is essentially a way for added flexibility in the Code to say, if a site meets a certain criterion, then the applicant would be allowed to apply for a minor modification which will allow a little bit of wiggle room with standards that are generally numeric or very clear. Like a setback is 20 feet – if you can't meet a setback because there is a trail system or whatever in the way, then the minor modification tool would allow Staff and the final decision maker whoever that is to approve a modification from that standard up to a certain percentage. He showed some examples of that from other cities, like a front building setback for a 6,000 square foot lot or smaller could be approved up to 25%, so if there is a 10' setback, 25% of that is 2 ½ feet – that would be a minor modification. Parking would probably be the biggest issue, so if there are constraints where there is not enough room for 20 parking spaces, but they can have 19. Staff could say redesign the project or say it is understandable that the site meets the criteria, so Staff can approve the project with 19 parking spaces instead of 20. The whole idea of this is so that there is not just a black and white, unfriendly way of review anymore. **Commissioner Wendel** agreed with that and added that she noted that Staff keeps citing examples from other cities and wanted to know if they were in Utah. **Mr. Spung** said none of the other example cities are in Utah.

9.11 **Site Plan Review**. Right now, there is just one site plan process, which is okay, but it may be worthwhile to consider two separate processes for major and minor site plans. The thresholds for that could be the number of dwelling units proposed. So, anything with 100 units or more could go through a more major type of review process which triggers additional requirements. Anything that is minor has less review or requirements. That will be looked at during the drafting process for this plan to see if it makes sense for Taylorsville. It might if more things are being allowed in more areas or if removing density caps, for example to say if an applicant is proposing more than 50 units it would be a major site plan that comes to the Planning Commission. However, if that is done there must be a stated reason for it to come to the Planning Commission for instance, something that the Code doesn't already allow for example. 

9.12 **Mr. Spung** said that concluded his presentation and asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners. 

9.12.1 **Commissioner Wright** noted Staff wrote at the beginning of the presentation that it is desirable that Taylorsville be locally and nationally competitive. He asked if there were one or two things that stood out in Staff's mind that display that this is helping Taylorsville to be more locally and nationally competitive. **Mr. Spung** said it circles back to what the goals of the City are, and he felt the goals of the City was to be an attractive place for people to work and to live, then removing the barriers to create that type of place is a huge incentive to create that place. If we want Taylorsville to be a great place but we don't allow the City to change or adapt into becoming a great place, then it is not going to be competitive with other cities that are doing those things.

9.12.2 **Commissioner Wright** followed up with regards to natural places, natural environments, living things; that are really the foundation of what makes us who we are, it appeared to him from the Code, where it is at right now, is that we haven't done much in that direction. He suspected that there could be a whole bunch of reasons for that, but his feeling was that somehow Taylorsville must in the Development Code or somewhere else, initiate a substantial effort to protect the little that we have and encourage more meaningful places. He gave an example to be the Jordan River Parkway, which is the most meaningful natural

place in the City, and which is very much in need of attention. By adding little landscape requirements to pads here throughout the City does help to soften things up but from a natural standpoint that does very little environmentally speaking. Providing for something like a landscaped garden area is nice overall with one here and one but that isn't going to do whole lot. He felt Staff has done a wonderful job on this plan so far and he felt it will help Taylorsville be more competitive. However, Taylorsville hasn't done much regarding the natural environment, so he encouraged Staff to add more effort in that arena.  He especially liked the image Mr. Spung displayed showing the bridge across the Jordan River and felt that was aspirational for most of Taylorsville and he seriously felt that needs addressing by the City Council more earnestly. That is a significant natural area and shouldn't be forgotten. If the City truly wants to go into the national competitive environment, substantially more effort must be undertaken along the river. 

- 9.12.3 **Commissioner Wendel** wondered if City or school parks, are considered open spaces and if that was the reference being made as those being natural spaces or thinking in terms of what existed before the urbanization that the City is trying to preserve.
- 9.12.4 **Commissioner Wright** felt it could involve all of that. Obviously working with school districts presents its own challenge to work into that environment. It would be difficult but shouldn't be taken off the board. Involvement with canals in the City are probably the second most important area that needs to be reviewed and often this time of year they are in not the best of shape. He felt action for that would go under the Land Development Code. His point was that focus needs to be directed to those issues now. **Mr. Spung** agreed and said the General Plan update will be a component of that also to establish the goals and vision. The City can look at what the current General Plan says with regard to those types of facilities use. He concurred that it is a valued asset in the community. If there is a big shift that the community needs to make to focus on those types of places and amenities, then the first step is to address it in the General Plan and then add that into the Land Use Code. There are several things that can be done with the Code that would help preserve and protect a lot of those areas.
- 9.12.5 **Commissioner Wright** wondered if there one or two things that stand out that display that this is helping the City be more locally and nationally competitive. **Mr. Spung** said yes, it goes back to what the goals of the City are, one of which is to be an attractive place for people to work in and live in; wherein this is removing some of the barriers to create that type of place which is a huge incentive to create that place. We want Taylorsville to be a great place but right now we don't allow the City to change or adapt into becoming a great place and it is not going to be competitive with other cities that are doing those things. That other cities offer incentives to developers such as offering less setback areas, less parking, etc., for more quality in their project.
- 9.12.6 **Commissioner Wright** followed up regards to natural places, natural environments, living things – the things that are really the foundation of what makes the City what it really is. It appeared to him from the Code where it is at right now is that the City hasn't done much, for which he felt there probably were many reasons about that. His feeling was that somehow probably in the Land Development Code, there needs to be a more substantial effort take place to protect the little that does exist and encourage more meaningful places. He also suggested better use of the overlay zones by better defining them. 

- 9.12.7 **Mr. Spung** said that Staff would be bringing the first draft back to the Planning Commission in May or June, thanked them for their input this evening.

NOTE: Tonight's meeting was a work session for discussion only. No motion or actions are required.

Commissioner McElreath asked for reports from assigned Commissioners for the City Council meetings they had attended.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: **Commissioner Wendel** and **Commissioner Quigley** gave their reports for City Council meetings attended. 

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Burggraaf** the meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

These Minutes were prepared and submitted by:

Jean Gallegos

Jean Gallegos, Admin Assistant/Recorder for the
City of Taylorsville Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on April 13, 2021.