



2267 N 1500 W  
Clinton UT 84015

**Planning Commission Members**

*Gregory Allen  
Dan Evans  
Mark Gregersen  
Dave Jones  
Chad Hansen  
Jennive Miller  
Trent Williams*

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>March 5, 2026</b>	<b>Call to Order</b>	<b>6:07 pm.</b>
<b>Staff Present</b>	Community Development Director Peter Matson, Planner Keaton Jones, and Becky Smith recorded the minutes.		
<b>Attendees</b>	None		
<b>Prayer or Thought</b>	Commissioner Gregersen		
<b>Pledge</b>	Commissioner Williams		
<b>Roll Call/Attendance</b>	Commissioners present were Commissioner Evans, Commissioner Allen, Commissioner Gregersen, Commissioner Jones, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Miller, and Commissioner Williams.		
<b>Declaration of Conflicts</b>	None		
<b>SUMMITTED BY:</b>	Keaton Jones, City Planner, Peter Matson, Community Development Director		
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>The Planning Commission Rules of Procedure (ROP) establish how the Commission is organized, how meetings are conducted, and how decisions are made. These rules function as the Commission’s operating manual and are intended to ensure consistency, fairness, and compliance with state and local requirements. Two versions of the Rules of Procedure are provided for review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ATTACHMENT A</a> – Redlined Copy:</li> </ul> <p>This version includes changes the staff originally proposed plus to the existing Rules of Procedure and the changes discussed by the Commission last month. Additions, deletions, and edits are marked so Commissioners can clearly see what changes are being considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ATTACHMENT B</a> – Clean Copy:</li> </ul> <p>This is a clean version with all the proposed changes without the strikeout/underlined text. This latest version also includes changes to the</p>		

	<p>outline/structure of the document for improved clarity. The Rules of Procedure are organized in the following chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 1 – Organization of the Commission: Establish officer roles (Chair and Vice Chair), terms, and staff support.</li> <li>• Chapter 2 – Rights and Duties of Members: Addresses attendance, conflicts of interest, voting responsibilities, and member conduct.</li> <li>• Chapter 3 – Meetings: Covers meeting types, notice requirements, quorum, work sessions, and meeting length.</li> <li>• Chapter 4 – Procedures: Outlines agendas, public hearings, motions, debate, voting, and parliamentary procedures.</li> <li>• Chapter 5 – Amendments: Describes how the Rules of Procedure may be amended.</li> <li>• Chapter 6 – Recording of Rules: Addresses recordkeeping and distribution of adopted rules</li> </ul> <p>Mr. Matson and Commissioners discussed several different ways to change some of the wording within the chapters listed above in the rules of procedures.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<p>The Commission advised they would like to see the final draft once all changes have been made.</p>
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are smaller, secondary dwelling units allowed on lots with a primary single-family home. ADUs can take several forms, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal ADUs – located entirely within the existing home</li> <li>• Attached ADUs – created as an addition to the home</li> <li>• Detached ADUs – located in a separate structure, typically in the rear or side yard</li> </ul> <p>In 2022, the City Council adopted regulations for internal ADUs in response to State law requirements. In March 2025, the City Council approved amendments to the ADU Standards (Chapter 28-3-27) to expand and clarify regulations for attached and detached ADUs. These amendments were intended to clearly distinguish between the different ADU types and to establish development standards for detached ADUs located in separate structures.</p>

Since the February 5<sup>th</sup> Commission review of these issues, staff have worked on a list of ordinance issues that would be helpful to clarify or change. Staff are still refining the discussion points and graphics for this discussion. Please look for a separate email with additional information for this agenda item. The existing ADU code development standards and the list of discussion items are attached with the intent to assist staff prior to your subsequent review of draft code updates.

Mr. Matson advised staff has found that the combination of ADU/garages code needs to be refined and clarified. Staff are proposing size limits on the garage part that does include the ADU. The consideration of having the ADU match the setbacks of the garage was also considered, but they are still currently discussing that.

Mr. Matson advised there are two residential zones in the city where there are height considerations of the ADU's, and garages with the ADU need to be adjusted. As the ADU cannot be taller than the primary dwelling. Another issue that has been found deals with parking when the garage and ADU are combined. One parking stall is required for the ADU, which is usually located on the side of the driveway. But when they have a detached garage and want access back to the ADU the parking standards are different in different zones. The staff wants to clarify the standards to something that is meaningful for both.

Commissioner Gregerson asked if we are talking about the law of unforeseen consequences when talking about detached garages and detached ADU's. Is it in the context of wanting to construct a new garage that is detached in conjunction with a new ADU that is connected to it?

Mr. Matson advised those are the issues that staff is currently dealing with; however, it was contemplated in a City Council discussion when this was adopted that a situation could happen that there is an existing detached garage that the homeowner wants to modify into an ADU. A garage only has to be 5 feet from the rear property line, whereas the ADU setback is 10 feet. The language in the code as it stands allows that to happen. We need a standard non-conformation, and can that be corrected and make it work?

Commissioner Evans asked if there has been a structure, like a barn, located on a property, can it be converted into an ADU? Adding that the window would be located higher than the house closest to it and it would be taller than the primary dwelling. Would that have to fall within the setbacks as well?

Mr. Matson advised yes and they would have to go with the most restrictive requirements. He hopes that a section of code is defined for this specific instance setting its own standards. He added we could always add another section to the current table or make a completely different table so when this situation comes up

staff will go to that set of standards. This is not happening a lot, but it has happened enough that he believes the standards should be defined.

Commissioner Williams advised adding another table would create two different standards for the ADU's, and since this is somewhat a unique situation this would give them an allowance to do something we normally would not allow.

Commissioner Hansen asked if windows could be restricted? If they are within the required setback, can they not be allowed to have any fenestrations on that side?

Commissioner Evans advised these are all the items that need to be looked at.

Commissioner Gregersen added this seems to come back to the question of why we are talking about what the reason behind it is. Often when looking at the reason why answers the questions about what should be allowed and what should not. I am not talking about a specific question, but we are saying the reasons garages are allowed closer to the property line is for safety and privacy. Then for the same reasons an ADU is considered something that should be further from the property line. Then the concern is someone may come in and achieve something that was prohibited such as building a garage that is now becoming a residence. Then if the why is violated then our ordinance should be tailored somehow to preserve the rational, protecting the public by increasing the distance when it not just for cars but for people to live in is how I am understanding it.

Commissioner Hansen asked if the height on a detached garage being converted to an ADU is a potential issue too? Can you have a detached garage that is taller than the primary building? Then what can be done to close the loophole that allows someone to put a "garage" and then turn it into an ADU at a later time that is 35 feet high.

Mr. Jones advised the residential development standards table specifies the maximum height requirement for accessory buildings. A typical accessory building can be up to 25 feet in height to the peak of the roof, or if it is an accessory building large lot it can be 30 feet in height if it is placed 40 feet or more behind the home. A footnote on the table also clarifies that an accessory building on a residential lot should not be taller than the primary structure unless it is located a minimum of 10 feet behind the primary structure. The agricultural zones have similar height restrictions. The only difference is that the accessory building large lot can be up to 35 feet in height if it is placed 40 feet or more behind the home.

Mr. Jones also added the height of an accessory garage being converted to an ADU is not really addressed in our ADU code. The conditions for conversion talk about how the structure must meet all applicable building, fire, safety, and other municipal codes. It also specifies that no new windows or other openings shall be allowed on any side of the building that are closet to the property lines than the setbacks listed in our ADU code. Only structures that legally existed prior to March 23, 2025, are eligible to be converted to an ADU.

Commissioner Gregersen added he believes that the reason an ADU should have further setback requirements is for fire safety and privacy.

Mr. Matson asked Mr. Jones what other instances he has seen where an ADU has a single car garage, and they are wanting to make it have a 2 or 3 car garage then it becomes like a shop or garage. He advised it should be limited when it is attached to an ADU.

Mr. Jones advised smaller residential properties have a 25% impervious surface ratio and once you get half acre and acre lots that garage that is attached to the ADU can be as big as they wanted to go.

Mr. Matson advised there is a provision that says an ADU coverage in the rear yard does not count towards the maximum coverage ratio.

Mr. Jones advised the garage space does not count for the ADU, but a garage does count on the impervious surface. Although driveways do not count in the impervious surface.

Commissioner Miller asked if dirt could be used as a driveway.

Mr. Matson advised it has to be a drivable hard surface. It could be a combination of road base and gravel. Ratio percentage is something that should count towards it.

Mr. Jones had Mr. Matson show an example of where a driveway does not count as an impervious surface.

Commissioner Hansen asked if additional curb cuts were allowed.

Mr. Jones advised the code does not specify whether curb cuts are permitted for ADU's specifically, but generally, on a corner lot you are able to have one cut per frontage, or two cuts on one frontage as long as these meet the standards in our city code for multiple driveway approaches. Based on the zone a home is located in, there is a percentage of the overall frontage that can be a driveway approach.

Mr. Matson asked the Commission what their thoughts are regarding parking for an ADU. Should it be limited to beside the existing driveway?

Commissioner Hansen advised that he does not have an issue with ADU residents parking in the driveway. But, not in the street, especially during the winter months.

Commissioner Miller asked if there are any standards?

Commissioner Williams asked if there are regulations saying that they cannot? He also asked if there are any State codes regulating this? Or does it state that it needs to be talked about at the city level?

Mr. Matson advised the state codes, as they are written right now, are regarding internal and attached ADU's, and cities do have to allow that. The City Council has also talked about wanting to produce regulations for detached ADU's.

Commissioner Evans asked are we trying to control those? Are we trying to determine what the regulations need to be?

Commissioner Miller asked if staff have talked to other cities and asked what they have been adopting in their codes.

Commissioner Hansen asked if this is about affordability, why is there a garage? A garage adds to the cost of the dwelling.

Mr. Matson said Nielson Homes are building dwellings that are without garages, but the finishes are the same as their marketable homes. They look really nice but a year ago the homes were still around \$400,000.

Commissioner Williams advised the problem is the city building codes, the cities have over regulated it. He gave an example he had come across in West Point where a developer was proposing car ports instead of garages and there was not a desire for them in the city.

Mr. Matson advised the city has relaxed our code regarding the requirement of having a garage. Studies have shown that the garage increases the price of the dwelling.

Commissioner Williams advised that he would rather see a car parked in a garage rather than a carport.

Commissioner Evans said the question here is why did the state do this? Was it so there would be more density, more houses per lot, which is a different subject than affordable housing. If a garage pushes the price over the affordability threshold, then in the spirit of the law to make it affordable, the outcome is the exact opposite of the desired effect.

Commissioner Gregersen asked if there are many towns around our city that do allow external ADU's?

Mr. Matson advised Layton has always allowed external ADU's.

Commissioner Gregersen advised he has heard Layton, and Farmington do allow ADU's. Is it a rarity for a city to allow detached ADU's? He also advised he thought

Commissioner Miller's idea of looking at other cities codes was very interesting. He added it is always very difficult to foresee unintended consequences, and advised this is one of those instances. With what is happening regarding garages, and it might be interesting to see what issues other cities have dealt with and thus incorporated those circumstances into a code they have come up with, even perhaps other states.

Mr. Matson advised there is information out there, and staff have been trying to understand some of the bizarre situations and requests that the city has received. They have now come to a stage where they can start inquiring about other cities.

Mr. Jones stated the benefit of having a code will allow citizens to do this in a legal way.

Commissioner Gregersen agrees that it is important to plan. It seems like a good balance has been made, allowing ADU's and the growth does need to be managed appropriately. He is just making a comment about the way to get there, that it is always good to rely on and reach out and see how other cities dealt with their unique requests. Maybe there are some things that are unique in the way people have applied there, but in large measure it could be that other cities have experienced some of these issues, maybe some of them for several years, on what they have allowed. It might be that our city has a different mentality than some other cities about such as we do not necessarily copy their ordinance, but perhaps there are some things we can learn in order to achieve what you say about things being regulated and be proactive to manage how they occur.

Commissioner Williams would like to see a clear equity line across the board and say I am sorry you are unique but here is the standard and that would be more equitable for everyone going across the board. Even if you have this existing, and even if you met it there, this was the standard. After reading the code there were some caveats for after the standard were adopted and older homes had some provisions in there. He thought that would be fair, particularly with an older one that is pre code. There is not much that could be done with that, his thought was equity in special exceptions or writing the new code.

Commissioner Gregersen advised there can sometimes be a tendency to create a monster out of the code by creating new pieces of it for each new request. He stated a saying that a U.S. Supreme Court Justice once said that hard cases make bad law, and they were talking about court cases as opposed to statutes and ordinances, but to the extent that things can be treated uniformly it allows more simplicity, readability of the code and typically more equity as there is a uniform application of the rules.

Commissioner Evans stated we as the planning commission, we believe we should have one code for ADU's or a separate for agricultural and a separate code for residential? Or do we combine those into our existing codes?

	<p>Commissioner Hansen advised he believed all should apply. They do not want to separate the codes but believe that all codes should apply across the board.</p> <p>Commissioner Evans asked would that make them part of the overall code?</p> <p>Commissioner Williams advised he does not believe there is a need for a new code for certain exceptions. Let us have the code clear, concise, equal, and not do separate codes for different instances, have one code for all to follow.</p> <p>Commissioner Evans asked if it is the city’s job to help citizens understand what the code means? And how they would apply to an ADU.</p> <p>Commissioner Hansen advised that by adding provisions to the code, it will not change the code when special things are requested that may give someone a special advantage.</p> <p>Commissioner Evans gave an example if you had an old garage that was 5 feet off the property line and it’s 40 years old and if someone wanted to make it into an ADU they would be given special privileges because they have an old garage.</p> <p>Commissioner Williams responded by saying the code already speaks to that.</p> <p>Commissioner Evans asked if this discussion was going to be tabled for another time.</p> <p>Mr. Matson advised yes it should be tabled.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	<p>Commissioner Allen moved that the Planning Commission continue this item to the next meeting and direct staff to prepare a draft redlined version of the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Standards that incorporates the policy direction and modifications discussed by the Commission. Commissioner Williams seconded the motion to table the discussion and added to move the discussion until staff have had adequate time to receive feedback from other cities and how they are moving forward with ADU’s. Commission all advised aye.</p>
<p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p>This training session builds on the discussion from the last meeting. We will review the State law and required General Plan elements. Through the course of 2025, the Clinton General Plan update process has taken us through the research and public outreach phases. Presently, we are working on the various elements (chapters) of the Plan document. A draft outline of the General Plan document is attached. The consultant (Psomas) has completed drafts of the housing, economic development, and land use elements of the Plan. Staff are reviewing the draft elements and providing feedback to the consultant.</p> <p>Draft future land use maps are available to review at <a href="http://clintongeneralplan.mysocialpinpoint.com">clintongeneralplan.mysocialpinpoint.com</a>. The project webpage includes a survey for feedback on the draft overall city future land use map and maps of the north, south,</p>

	<p>and west small area plans. These are maps that were presented at the last public outreach event in October 2025 – General Plan Open House and Food Truck Rally. Some of the maps are in this packet, but the webpage has all the maps and the most recent surveys.</p> <p>Mayor Dougherty and the City Council have scheduled the first <a href="#">joint Council/Commission work meeting</a> to review and refine the draft land use maps. This will be held on <a href="#">Tuesday, March 24<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm in the Police (or Fire) training room</a> – we will confirm the location via email.</p> <p>I have prepared a presentation for the Commission meeting that goes into more detail about the General Plan update process, some of the data and the draft future land use maps.</p>
<b>Conclusion</b>	The Planning Commission completed this training session.
<b>DIRECTORS REPORT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VK Electric stalled</li> <li>• Championship Martial Arts</li> </ul>
<b>COMMISSIONERS REPORT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioner Williams will not be at next meeting</li> </ul>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<i>Commissioner Gregersen moved to adjourn. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Voting is as follows; Commissioner Allen, aye; Commissioner Miller, aye; Commissioner Jones, aye; Commissioner Evans, aye; Commissioner Hansen, aye; Commission Gregersen, aye; Commission Williams, aye. The meeting adjourned at 8:41pm.</i>

*Reviewed and Approved by the  
Clinton City Planning  
Commission on this 2nd day of  
April 2026*