

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
October 11, 2022
Pre-meeting – 6:30 p.m. – Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

Attendance:

Planning Commission

David Wright – Chair (Excused)
Lynette Wendel – Vice Chair
Don Quigley
Cindy Wilkey
Don Russell – (Excused)
Marc McElreath
Gordon Willardson
David Young (Alternate)


Community Development Staff

Jim Spung – Senior Planner
Jean Gallegos – Admin Assistant/Recorder

CITIZENS/GUESTS PRESENT: Bob Knudson, Ernest Burgess, Mitch Morris, Mrs. Morris, Brian Prince.

BRIEFING SESSION – 6:30 P.M.

1. The Briefing Session was conducted by **Mr. Jim Spung**. He reviewed the item on the Agenda this evening and discussed the request for a public hearing of a preliminary non-administrative conditional use permit and site plan to construct a free-standing tunnel carwash at 3685 West 5400 South, Taylorsville, Utah. The main thought regarding this project is that it is an existing old style, wand type car wash. They plan to upgrade this into a tunnel type. He answered Commissioner's questions regarding this proposal, the majority of which were relative to the noise decibel and light control this will generate and the amount of queuing space being provided on such a small lot.

Commissioner Wendel opened the meeting with the Planning Commission statement and welcomed those in attendance. 

GENERAL MEETING – 7:00 P.M.





Consent Agenda:





2. Approval of the Planning Commission Minutes for August 23 and September 27, 2022.
MOTION: Commissioner Quigley – I move for approval of the Consent Agenda, consisting of the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for August 23, 2022, and September 27, 2022.
SECOND: Commissioner Willardson
VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.



Conditional Use Permit

3. 52C22 – CUP -Public Hearing and Consideration of a Preliminary Non-Administrative Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan to Construct a Free-Standing Tunnel Carwash at 3685 West 5400 South, Taylorsville, Utah. (Jim Spung/AICP/Senior Planner)

- 3.1 **Mr. Spung** presented this item.  This is a conditional use review. In State Code, Conditional Use means a land use that because of unique characteristics or potential impact of the land use on the municipality, surrounding neighbors or adjacent land uses may not be compatible in some areas or may be compatible only when certain conditions are required that mitigate or eliminate the detrimental impacts. In the






Taylorville Land Use Code, a car wash use which is the proposed use on the subject site is a non-administrative conditional use because it falls within 250' of a residential district. Otherwise, it would be an administrative review but because of the close-proximity to residential, it requires Planning Commission review and approval.  The Planning Commission's role is to review the application and hold a public hearing.


- 3.1.1 He showed an aerial image of the subject property. This site is located on the south side of 5400 South just east of Bangerter Highway. It is an existing self-service car wash facility open 24 hours a day. On the north side of the building are three different bays for vacuums and on the south side of the building is a circulation and parking area. There is currently in place a temporary storage container which will ultimately be removed. Also, in the front along the 5400 South corridor there is a small kiosk that serves drinks which will also be removed for the new tunnel car wash structure. 
- 3.1.2 The current General Plan designation for this property is Community Commercial as is the zoning designation. He showed the site plan for the project. The new tunnel carwash would be built on the west side of the property. Vehicles would enter the northeast portion of the property, que on the north end and then enter the carwash tunnel through the north and exit on the south, wrap around and then there would be 17 vacuum bays available for use.
- 3.1.3 The anticipated hours of operation are 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sunday.
- 3.1.4 This proposal isn't expected to significantly alter traffic or parking demands from the current use and the existing driveway on the west side of the site would be closed and the existing driveway on the east side would be narrowed slightly. There is no specific parking minimum identified in the Code for a carwash use, and Section 13.24.080, paragraph A says, "Parking for uses not specifically listed shall be provided in the same ratio as the use most nearly approximating the characteristics of the unlisted use, as determined by the Planning Commission for non-administrative conditional uses" Given that this is a vehicle establishment, it not anticipated that people would be parking and going anywhere, other than the vacuum bays. The applicant did mention that it at any given time there would be up to two employees on site, so they would need to park somewhere on the property. Staff feels that if the employees were to park in the vacuum bay that would be sufficient and just minimizes the number of vacuum stalls that would be available for the customers. 
- 3.1.5 The standards for drive-through facilities, Section 13.23.170, states that "Queuing lanes shall not be located between the building and the street unless there is no alternative for location of the building and queuing lane(s) on the site." The current configuration for this proposal does have the queuing lanes between the building and the street. He commented that the applicant has stated he is prepared to show several versions of a site plan wherein they have tried to make that work to meet the standards and just couldn't quite get there. They are prepared to address that with the Commission tonight. 
- 3.1.6 There is an 8' high masonry wall in place. Another item that needs to be dealt with is the noise generated from this use. The decibel figures for the vacuum were provided but Staff needs one for the dryer blowers on the site. Ideally, they would not exceed 55 decibels. The Director would be the final and Staff recommends approval of this application.  He then asked if the Commissioners had any questions.







- 3.1.7 **Commissioner Willardson** suggested turning the fans in a different direction to lessen the noise. **Mr. Spung** said that one problem is the drive through queuing standards. That adjacent to the residential property, the queuing would be 30' therefrom and that flipping those fans would be a challenge.  **Commissioner Quigley** asked what the distance was between the rear entrance of the car wash and the two-story house there and **Mr. Spung** replied that from the edge of the car wash to the edge of that building is 35'. 

3.2 **FINDINGS:**


- 3.2.1 This application was initiated by Mitch Morris, Coldwater Capital, on behalf of Shiny Shell Carwash.
- 3.2.2 The subject property is located at 3685 West 5400 South and is one parcel with a cumulative area of approximately 0.69 acres.
- 3.2.3 The property is developed, and its' current use is a 24-hour free-standing self-service carwash with seven self-serve wash bays and one automatic wash bay.
- 3.2.4 The subject property is in the Community Commercial (CC) zoning district.
- 3.2.5 The subject property is in the "Community Commercial" designation in the City's General Plan.
- 3.2.6 The subject property is located within 250 feet of a residential zoning district.
- 3.2.7 The applicant is requesting removal of existing structures and improvements to construct a new tunnel carwash facility to be owned and operated by Shiny Shell Carwash.
- 3.2.8 Section 13.08.020(E) of the Land Development Code requires a car wash land use receive non-administrative conditional use approval when located within 250 feet of a residential zoning district.
- 3.2.9 The Land Development Code delegates authority to the Planning Commission to establish a minimum vehicle parking requirement for a carwash.
- 3.2.10 Queuing lanes shall not be located between the building and the street unless there is no alternative for location of the building and queuing lane(s) on the site. The proposed site plan includes a queuing lane between the building and 5400 South.
- 3.2.11 This conditional use permit request is consistent with current zoning and General Plan designations.
- 3.2.12 One potential negative impact created by the proposed use is increased noise created by vehicle vacuum systems and the tunnel carwash blower/air driers.
- 3.2.13 A noise level test or sound study has not been provided to determine the anticipated decibel (dB) level measured along the southern property line.
- 3.2.14 An 8-foot-high precast wall is proposed to be installed along the southern property line to separate the existing single-family residential properties from the commercial use.
- 3.2.15 Emerald Green Arborvitae (evergreen trees) that grow to be 15 feet tall are proposed in the southwest corner of the property to provide additional buffering between the proposed use and the existing residential properties.
- 3.2.16 The proposed site plan has been reviewed by City Departments and Review Agencies and has been determined to be in general compliance with City standards. Any outstanding review comments must be addressed prior to final approval.
- 3.2.17 Staff and review agencies have identified conditions of approval to be considered by the Planning Commission prior to preliminary approval.
- 3.2.18 The Planning Commission is the decision-making authority for preliminary non-administrative conditional use permit review. Final review authority is granted to the Director, unless otherwise directed by the Planning Commission.

- 3.3 **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:** Staff recommends approval of the request, subject to the following conditions:
- 3.3.1 The Director is authorized to conduct the final non-administrative conditional use and site plan review.
- 3.3.2 All outstanding City department and review agency comments be resolved, and subsequent revisions comply with applicable City ordinances, codes, and standards prior to issuance of final non-administrative conditional use permit and site plan approval.
- 3.3.3 A sound study be submitted to estimate noise levels (dB) of the proposed use on both the north and south sides of the wall along the southern property line. Average noise levels generated from the carwash use shall not exceed 55 dB on the residential side (south side) of the wall. For purposes of this standard, the sound measurements are to be calculated with a decibel meter approximately 5 feet above ground level for a duration of 10 minutes.
- 3.4 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends approval subject to the Findings and Conditions outlined in the Staff Report.
- 3.5 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Mitch Morris**. 3135 S. Richmond Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.  He said they have spent a significant amount of time with the City's Development Review Committee to correctly fit this proposal into the City. That they have submitted a dozen different site plans so far and is very appreciative to Staff for their assistance in this regard. He provided a little background, saying that self-service style car washes are going away to be replaced with tunnel type ones. That requires updating the equipment which would be a significant undertaking. He said he would be glad to answer any questions. 
- 3.5.1 **Commissioner Wilkey** asked what the volume has been for the existing car wash and was told that a typical Saturday after a snowstorm would have about 75 cars or more. That the volume would be nowhere near that presently compared to say a Mr. Carwash. That this carwash would concentrate more on giving great service. **Commissioner Wilkey** expressed concern if that level of service could be handled on this size site and said it was her understanding that about eight cars would fit in the queue. **Mr. Morris** said that was correct and that it will be necessary to close one of the present accesses.  In comparison to other Shiny Car Washes in the valley, he felt this location should easily meet the demand and anticipated no problem. They have another location in operation in Draper which is smaller than these one on .66 acres and there is stacking room for six cars there, with another three or four before entering into the tunnel. **Commissioner Wilkey** wanted to know if this car wash pulls the cars through and **Mr. Morris** said that was correct, that the driver stays in the car and is pulled through on a conveyor style belt. There are also self-service vacuums on site. 
- 3.5.2 **Commissioner Willardson** asked what the percentage of water being recycled was for this use. **Mr. Morris** replied that West Valley City gave them an award for water-wise usage and that 70% of the water is recycled.
- 3.5.3 **Commissioner Quigley** asked that even though this project was smaller than others in the City he wondered how many car washes would constitute too much saturation of this type of use. He wondered why this one would be more successful than the larger ones in existence presently in the City. **Mr. Morris** commented that this one is owner-operated, with site visits. That they offer a number of services that go above and beyond that normally seen, such as different types of cleaners in bottles,  compressed air guns to clean under the seats, free complimentary soda, "kid zones", ceramic wax, and the extra premium of a locally owned mentality and care. **Commissioner Quigley** asked if there would be a waiting room in this one and **Mr. Morris** said there was. **Commissioner Quigley** expressed concern for the survival of this business in the current







market and wanted to make sure it did not fail. However, felt nothing described is different than what other car washes here have. **Mr. Morris** advised Commissioner Quigley had identified correctly that a self-service car wash would not survive in this market, hence the need to invest significant money in amenities in this type of the tunnel type car wash to even have a chance to compete. 









- 3.5.4 **Commissioner McElreath**  had questions about the noise emanating from the dryers; at other locations and concerns regarding the noise from the dryer fan and vacuums affecting the residential area. He asked if they had any other locations that have similar layouts. **Mr. Morris** said their Murray location at 3608 South 900 East has the property line at 38 feet from the edge of the exit end of the tunnel and there are townhomes directly on the other side, similar to this location. The townhomes are approximately 20' from the property line there where this is 10' at this location. They have been able to meet City and County noise ordinances there, admittedly having had learned some hard lessons there and making corrections. Therefore, they are aware of what it takes to satisfy the noise demands and to be good neighbors to the residential neighborhood. **Commissioner McElreath** asked if he knew the decibel level of the fan when standing 6' away from it. **Mr. Morris** said at 6' away, they will still be inside the tunnel. **Commissioner McElreath** advised he meant 6' from the outside. **Mr. Morris** said he did not have those figures readily available. Unofficially he said it was around 70 decibels but later corrected that to 65 decibels.  **Commissioner McElreath** asked what their plan was if the cars extend out to 5400 South. **Mr. Morris** said he could not answer that question but advised that at other locations they have been able to speed up the processing line so that doesn't happen. 
- 3.5.5 **Commissioner Willardson** wanted to know if this car wash would be brushless or have brushes. **Mr. Morris** said due to the smaller size of this project, it probably would have brushes.
- 3.5.6 **Commissioner Young**  asked what the landscaping would consist of and was informed by **Mr. Morris** that it will be "waterwise", gravel, mulch, local plants and drought resistant plants. 
- 3.5.7 **Commissioner Wilkey** wondered what the length of time was to go through the car wash and **Mr. Morris** said it was roughly two minutes total. That there would be certain times that are busier than others but it would even out throughout the day. She then asked about the comparative price range and **Mr. Morris** said that standard membership would be \$25.00 or \$35.00 for the package deal.
- 3.5.8  **Commissioner Wendel** asked how many employees would be on site at a time. **Mr. Morris** advised mostly it would be two employees. She asked about emission control during idling and if there is a business practice in place to help support the reduction of idling. She wondered if that would be difficult if there is not an employee readily available to guide them to discontinue idling. She felt this would impact the quality of life of the neighbors as much as the noise levels. **Mr. Morris** added that was a good concern to raise. This company strives to be sustainable in all efforts with the water usage or lack thereof and one good thing about the queuing being in the front of the building is it is away from residential homes. The ordinance is in place to keep not only the noise down but emissions away from the homes. There are signs on all vacuum arches that ask people to turn off their engines and turn down their music. Obviously, that is an "ask" and not directive.
- 3.5.9 **Brian Prince** came forward to add that there are two pay systems. What is envisioned is one being exclusively for members with the technology that is called a license plate reader technology. If


you are a member, there will be a camera that reads the license plate at which time the gate opens automatically. He advised that when Mr. Morris said the time was 2 minutes, 15 seconds, that is absolutely conservative, so members will be able to pull in and go right through into the tunnel and those that are paying will be able to pull up to the kiosk, pay





and go. It eliminates stacking and moves cars faster and they are idling for less time. The time period previously discussed was from when they enter the site, not the time in the tunnel. The time through the tunnel is a lot less than 2 minutes.  He added that queuing is not going to be an issue and they have the technology in place to move the cars through faster. Their goal is to be the local guys that do a better job.

3.5.10 **Mr. Spung** commented that on the southwest side of the site it is not showing a wall or buffering. It drops down to about a 6' wall. The applicant will need to consider a solution for the west property line, not only for the residents but the restaurant there.


3.5.11 **Mr. Morris** added that on the Commissioner's suggestion that the fans might be flipped, it would push the building too far towards the access point.  As to why the building cannot run east to west, cars could not make the 180 degree turn into the entrance of the tunnel there at 35' and would need a minimum of 50' to do so. The other thing is they would not meet the City Ordinance because there would only be 20' between vacuum stalls. That they have tried to orient this in several different directions and felt this is the only one that will work. **Commissioner Willardson** felt they would be okay relevant to the noise levels. **Mr. Morris** said on the site plan it does mention the vacuum pumps and **Mr. Spung** had asked that they provide a photo of what those look like. It is essentially the same type of vacuum system that would exist in a garage of a house. These will have 50 mph horsepower motors, which would be the same amount of noise level, no matter if there is one or several vacuums going at once because it is a centralized vacuum system.  At 30 feet away, it would be 38 decibels per measurements taken by the manufacturers.  The pumps will be located on the northeast corner of the site which would be closer to the entrance of the car wash, which is still over 100' away from the residences to the south. So, there would not be a measurable noise impact on the neighbors to the south.  He continued on to say that he did notice on other sites they have developed, with Murray being the first express location, they have learned lessons and in every approving, body meeting they have spoken at, he has presented their own noise study to aid the discussion. That he had noticed in the Staff Report that someone from Staff had gone to the southwest corner of this lot and done some research, for which he expressed appreciation. **Mr. Morris** said he had gone out there on a week day and stood in the same spot as where Staff had measured the noise at 65 decibels average and he had counted it as 66 decibels. That reading was taken with no car wash equipment running and most of the noise coming from 5400 South traffic. Conditions of approval recommended in the Staff Report will all be complied with. One condition mentions to monitor the sound levels for a period of 10 minutes on the residential property on the south side of  the wall at 5' in height and that is exactly what Mr. Morris did. He went into the neighborhood and one neighbor came outside and asked him what he was doing in his driveway, which he explained was conducting a sound study for the car wash on the other side of the fence. That person resides in the two-story house most impacted and invited him onto his property to conduct his test. **Mr. Morris** said he only did one test for two minutes out of respect for those neighbors. The average currently as it is today is 61 decibels. The maximum was almost 74.6 decibels. He felt that the major contributor for noise comes from Bangerter Highway. The condition mentioned was that it could not exceed 55 decibels from the noise produced by the car wash. **Mr. Morris** said they plan on taking measures so that the City never hears about noise complaints from this operation.  **Mr. Morris** said he would be happy to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.

- 3.5.12 **Commissioner Willardson**  complimented the applicant on having done his homework well along with the quality of his presentation and answers given tonight.
- 3.5.13 **Commissioner Quigley**  wanted clarification as to if the neighbors in the two-story house were tenants or home owners to which **Mr. Morris** said  that the person he talked to was named Ronnie and said that the home belonged to his son. That he did not know if he was visiting or lived there.
- 3.5.14 **Commissioner Young**  asked when the new structure is completed how that would change the light pollution from how it is currently. **Mr. Morris** said there has been a lot of graffiti and damage to the present car wash back area. It necessitated moving the vacuums from the back of the lot to the front which has reduced the vandalism. There has been some lighting added which will not pollute the lighting levels and the lighting at the vacuums is turned down at closing and is then controlled with a timer system. All this is an effort to maintain a balance between lighting and alleviating security concerns. **Mr. Prince** added that the benefit to the new design is the vacuum stalls and inclusive lighting is pulled away from the residential area. There will be full cut-off lighting fixtures and wall packs on the building that will be in compliance. Staff will be able to review that beforehand. With the new car wash, the lighting will be closer to 5400 South and not right up against the south end.  In the Land Development Code there is a control point on that photometric to make sure there is no greater impact than what is there now. In fact, it will probably reduce as consolidation occurs in the parking lot.  **Commissioner Young** asked if they would be opposed to adding a sound wall from the southwest corner of the car wash to the property line to the south. **Mr. Morris** that they have added on the site plan a call out for an 8' precast wall. The plan is for the wall to be along the south side of the property and then wrap the west corner and tie right into the building. That would also help control the sound coming out of the tunnel. **Commissioner Wendel** asked **Mr. Spung** if that needed to be added to the motion, and he replied that it did.
- 3.5.15 **Commissioner Quigley**  asked if in the back part of the lot they planned to put wall pack type lighting, because that would indicate the light would be broadcasting towards the houses or were they talking about putting wall packs on the wall. The question was for the two-story house, if there was a wall pack shining there, it would be daytime all the time in that window. He wondered if they had looked in their lighting study to install downcast type lighting rather than wall packs. He did not see any design indicated for lighting but he heard mention of wall packs and needed clarification. **Mr. Morris** said that they want all downward facing directed lighting. **Commissioner Quigley** wanted to make clear that wall packs are not downward facing lights. **Mr. Morris** suggested that the wall pack type lighting that had been mentioned will be placed by an electrical engineer who does that photometric plan to meet the candle foot requirement of the City but also along with supporting the comfort level of that particular resident in the two-story home in mind.
- 3.5.16 **Mr. Prince** said  Commissioner Quigley's comment regarding wall packs is correct. He anticipates their engineer and architect teams will place those packs on the east side of the building with full cut-off light fixtures in specific places on some of the vacuum arches. Their recommendation won't be done before a full architectural design and photometric is conducted. The treatment for the exit of the tunnel would be 36" pipe bollard lighting at a lower level to light the tunnel exit. The reasoning is that the car just needs to see the edge of the curb as





they exit the tunnel.  The 36" to 40" pipe bollards with the downward full cap lighting would be the most appropriate treatment at the exit of the tunnel. There could also be some full cut-off lights on the arches and maybe some wall packs on east side. He agreed this issue is a real concern.



- 3.5.17 **Commissioner McElreath** asked Mr. Spung if there had been any complaints on the current car wash for either noise or lighting issues.  **Mr. Spung** said he was not aware of there being any such complaints. **Commissioner McElreath** asked for a repeat of the numbers regarding the sound study on the residential side of the wall. **Mr. Morris** said 61 decibels was the average and 74.6 decibels is the maximum there. **Commissioner McElreath** asked if that was with the car wash in service. **Mr. Morris** said he could not say for certain if there was someone using it at the time because there is an 8' high wall there but he did not hear any such noise himself. **Commissioner McElreath** asked Mr. Spung if it was correct that in the Staff Report he was recommending the number be 55 decibels. **Mr. Spung** said that was correct and was the reason for the request to conduct a sound study to see what the Ambien noise would be now in the residential yards. That number is just what the EPA recommends as being able to have a conversation within the back yards without it being difficult to hear. **Commissioner McElreath** asked if the motion is made to approve this, should they leave the number out and go with whatever the sound study comes back with. **Mr. Spung** said or to establish a maximum number or based on complaints. Staff's intent is just to insure if the neighbors have issues that there is some mechanism to address their concerns. It does affect their enjoyment of property rights.
- 3.5.18 **Commissioner Young** advised that it is obvious that the Commission is concerned about the noise and light levels due to the proximity to the residential area there. He thanked the applicants for their informative replies to the questions. **Mr. Prince** replied they are very aware that this will be an issue and are confident they will be able to control the noise and lighting on their site with the changes they will be making, i.e., pulling the vacuums further to the north, being confident that they can redesign the exit of the tunnel with a door, installing a higher connected wall, adding a structure on top of the exit to control the noise coming out of the exit tunnel and installing the appropriate lighting previously discussed. 
- 3.5.19 **Commissioner Wendel** added that she lives in the area of 6600 South and did understand the noise emanating from Bangerter Highway and was appreciative of the applicants being willing to own this and do whatever they can to minimize it.
- 3.5.20 **Commissioner Quigley**  advised the Planning Commission is a citizen's review board, therefore, Commissioners must put themselves in the position of the citizens and what they think. He wondered if they could flip this site putting the building on the other side. That would eliminate the two-story home problem. **Mr. Morris** said they did look at that possibility and found primarily due to the City's existing drive through facility ordinance, no queuing can be within the building setback next to a residential area, therefore, that would not work.  **Commissioner Quigley** asked if the site was flipped he could not see the difference between the queuing other than rather than having the queuing on the northwest side. **Mr. Morris** said they had discussed a different site plan with the Development Review Committee previously and they said it would not work. They were told it did not meet the setbacks outlined by the City. **Commissioner Quigley** said that what he was showing was a different site plan but was not a flipped image.
- 3.5.21 **Commissioner Wendel** said for clarification that instead of coming in, going south off of 5400 South and then traveling west to que, why cannot they pull in south from the west side of the property and travel east to que. **Mr. Morris** said the idea would be the residential home on the


west side is about 10' feet away and the one on the east side is about 13' away. **Commissioner Quigley** said what they are trying to avoid is the tunnel coming right there where the house is currently because an 8' or 10' wall or 30' tree isn't going to help a baby that is sleeping in that bedroom up there. **Commissioner Wendel** asked Mr. Spung if this had been under consideration at any time. **Mr. Spung** said they had not seen a site plan like that. Maybe it could be up to the applicant if it is something they could make work. **Commissioner Wendel** asked if Staff had any objections to consideration of that. **Mr. Morris** said it is a great point. With a left handed move make you on the driver's side and so as they access the proposed site plan, they are able to make that turn at a shorter distance versus a right handed turn it is a more difficult, blinder movement to be able to make and the building would have to be pushed to the south, which would mean the cars would not be straight by the time they arrived at the entrance to the tunnel. If the building could be moved 10' south it could be done but because of ordinance, that is not legal. **Commissioner Quigley** said on the Mr. Car Wash the Commission recently approved on Redwood Road, is making that turn and wasn't deemed unsafe. They are making the right hand turn as they que up and a right hand turn into the tunnel. **Commissioner Wendel** advised that it might have a longer distance and not be quite as tight of a turn as what this applicant is referring to.

3.5.22 **Commissioner Willardson** asked Mr. Spung if Staff had sent out notices to the people who live in the neighborhood and **Mr. Spung** replied Staff mailed all property owners within 300' of this proposed site. **Commissioner Willardson** advised that the fact that no one from the neighborhood is here tonight means they must be okay with it. 

3.6 **SPEAKING: Commissioner Wendel** opened the public hearing and since no one came forward to speak, closed it and opened the meeting up for discussion or a motion by the Commission.

3.7 **Commissioner Quigley**  commented that he sees too many flags regarding this project. That he appreciated the applicant's presentation but felt there were too many unanswered questions to be able to support this. He felt this was inconsistent when reviewing these proposals. That last month the Commission had made a big deal out of 100' but now is willing to change the ordinance with the idea that they can have the queuing up front instead of in the back.  Another concern he had was that the applicant says the demand will even out but what happens like on a snow day when everyone shows up at the carwash and there are cars backed up on 5400 South, which is a very busy road. The applicants say they will do a lighting survey and commit to that, that they will do a sound test and commit to that. That they are okay with the stacking on a regular basis but there are no guarantees once they get open for business, there is not going to be a problem with stacking of cars, especially with the possibility of it spilling out onto 5400 South.  That with the Mr. Carwash proposal, the Commission clearly had a long discussion about the height of the walls and trees regarding noise reduction and noted that their dry blowers were facing Redwood Road, not the homes to the east. The Commissioners were told then that the height of the wall doesn't make a difference as a sound barrier. There was also a discussion about what type of trees to put up and were told that the trees don't make a difference in the sound issue either, noting that it would be years before they grew big enough anyway. The difference in the 8' wall height and the 30' high trees doesn't consistently factor in with what the Commission based their decision on with the Mr. Car Wash site, noting that now trees and wall heights matter. His point is with the inconsistency. Also, no one seems to know if the person in the two-story house is a tenant or the owner. **Commissioner Quigley** noted the applicant showed their hours of operation showed that they would be open until 10:00 p.m. **Mr. Morris** said this business will close at 9:00 p.m. That their Murray location is situated next to residential and closes at 8:00 p.m. **Commissioner Quigley** summarized by saying that his biggest concern was about the potential for a traffic jam, especially on stormy days. That this is too small of a piece of property to accommodate this use and he could not support approving it. 

- 3.8 **Commissioner Willardson** commented that he lives closer to this site than anyone else on the Commission does and was supportive of the project. He added that the improvements being made to 4700 South will allow it to take a lot of heat off of 5400 South.
- 3.9 **MOTION: Commissioner McElreath** –  I move that we approve File #52C22, a preliminary non-administrative conditional use permit and site plan to construct a new carwash facility at 3685 West 5400 South in Taylorsville, Utah, as identified in Exhibit F, subject to the Findings outlined in the Staff Report and add that the wall discussed in tonight's meeting on the west side of the carwash tunnel, meet up with the other wall and the sound study be performed and at that point let Staff decide what the reasonable and appropriate number is for decibel levels created.
- SECOND: Commissioner Willardson** 
- ROLL CALL VOTE: Commissioner Quigley** – NAY, **Commissioner Wilkey** – AYE, **Commissioner Young** – AYE, **Commissioner McElreath** - AYE, **Commissioner Willardson** – AYE and **Commissioner Wendel** – AYE. Motion passes 5 to 1.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: Commissioner Wilkey gave her report for the meeting she attended October 5, 2022. 

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Young** and second by **Commissioner Wilkey**. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

These Minutes were prepared and presented by:

Jean Gallegos

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

Approved in meeting held on January 10, 2023.