

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, March 24, 2026
Civic Center
3925 N Cedar Hills Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Tyler Dahl, Presiding
Commissioner Bari Cruze
Commissioner Jeff Dodge
Commissioner Troy Newbold
Commissioner Steve Thomas
Commissioner Robert Wallace

Staff: Chandler Goodwin, City Manager/Planner
Sarah Sampson, Associate Planner
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

1. Call to Order.

Chair Tyler Dahl called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Public Comment.

There were no public comments.

The voting members for the Planning Commission Meeting were identified.

SCHEDULED ITEMS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. Approval of the Minutes from the January 27, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Newbold moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the January 27, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dodge. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cruze- Yes, Commissioner Dahl-Yes, Commissioner Dodge-Yes, Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Review/Recommendation and Public Hearing on amendments to City Code Title 10-5-5 related to Development in Required Setback Areas.

Associate Planner, Sarah Sampson, explained that the 2021 International Swimming Pool and Spa Code has updated barrier requirements for swimming pools and spas, allowing for specific safety covers in lieu of a fence or wall as a barrier. The covers must be automatic, for in-ground pools only, and must meet a specific ASTM specification. The proposed language would add provisions

that allow a barrier that complies with the current ISC code and all other building code requirements.

Ms. Sampson noted the addition of the word "spa" to the code language, explaining that in code terminology, a spa is distinct from a hot tub and refers to in-ground installations that fall under the same requirements as swimming pools. Above-ground installations have different requirements and were not included in this amendment.

Chari Dahl questioned the addition of the word "spa" and how it would impact the rest of the code section. Ms. Sampson clarified that spas, as defined in the International Swimming Pool and Spa Code, are in-ground installations similar to pools and fall under the same barrier requirements. Above-ground installations have different requirements.

Commissioners raised safety concerns about allowing automatic covers as an alternative to traditional fencing. Discussion turned to potential liability issues for both residents and the city. Commissioners questioned whether residents who fail to close their automatic covers would face increased liability, and whether the city could face liability for approving such installations.

Mr. Goodwin said that once the city inspects it, if it meets all the requirements for inspection at the time of approval, he would be hard-pressed to believe that the city would carry any liability for homeowner negligence in closing the pool.

Commissioners ultimately agreed that the proposed amendments align the city code with state building code requirements and that maintaining such alignment is administratively preferable. There was consensus that while safety concerns are valid, homeowner negligence in operating safety equipment would not reasonably create city liability.

Chair Dahl opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Commissioner Dahl moved to recommend APPROVAL to the City Council the proposed amendments to City Code 10-5-5. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Newbold. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cruze- Yes, Commissioner Dahl-Yes, Commissioner Dodge-Yes, Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Review/Recommendation and Public Hearing on amendments to City Code Title 10-5-32 related to Accessory Dwelling Units.

Ms. Sampson explained that the code currently does not explicitly limit the number of ADUs per lot, which could potentially allow both an internal ADU (such as in a basement) and an external detached ADU on the same property. The proposed amendment would add language specifying "only one accessory dwelling unit shall be allowed per lot."

Ms. Sampson said that we want to maintain the residential density that has been zoned for and not add more to it. She noted that the limitation maintains the accessory nature of the unit and helps preserve the neighborhood character, parking availability, and structure capacity.

Chair Dahl asked whether there have been issues with parking related to ADUs. Ms. Sampson responded that while there are not currently multiple ADUs on single lots in the city, parking concerns have been raised regarding ADUs in general, particularly because residents often use garages for storage rather than vehicle parking.

Chair Dahl expressed opposition to the proposed limitation, he said he thinks the city should allow more. He asked if it is still only limited by unrelated persons. Ms. Sampson said that occupancy limits for unrelated individuals would still apply to each ADU.

Discussion focused on whether a one-size-fits-all approach made sense for all lot sizes. Commissioner Cruze stated that not all lots are necessarily equal. He inquired about some of the larger lots in the city where there could be multiple ADUs and they could potentially accommodate multiple ADUs without problems.

Staff and commissioners engaged in detailed discussion regarding infrastructure capacity concerns.

City Manager, Chandler Goodwin, said that one of the bigger concerns is capacity of the infrastructure. Take the larger lot example which can be subdivided quite easily into a normal subdivision. And let's say that there was not a limit on capacity, or there was not a limit on densities of ADUs on a lot, someone could put an 800-square-foot tiny home, and it is tied to the utilities, and then put 3 or 4 separate little starter homes in the backyard. The issue with that is then you have the main dwelling, and you would have 4 tiny homes, each with a capacity that they are adding to the city's sewer system. He mentioned that we have to file a sewer capacity report about how much capacity you have in your sewer line to carry all the effluent away from the homes. When a house is built, you pay an impact fee for one home. We are already allowing a second. You also have a water issue where with each home the average water user uses between 6,000 and 8,000 gallons of water per month. They turn water over to the city for that average, 8,000 gallons for one home. But if you start adding homes, all of a sudden they are drawing on water rights that they do not have.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the city does not currently charge impact fees for ADUs and does not require water right dedications, explaining this is a deliberate policy because we want people to register their ADUs, we want to know where they are, and we want to know how many there are within the community.

Commissioners discussed specific use cases, including the scenario of a basement ADU combined with a detached structure in the backyard. Discussion of parking requirements revealed that while the city code previously required two off-street parking stalls for ADUs, the state changed this requirement to only one parking stall, reducing local control over parking standards.

Alternative approaches were discussed, including capping ADUs at two instead of one, allowing different numbers based on lot size (one for lots under an acre, two for lots over an acre), requiring additional off-street parking for a second ADU, imposing impact fees for second ADUs, and requiring minimum lot sizes for multiple ADUs.

Chair Dahl opened the public hearing.

Andy Lawrence, 10392 Waterbury Circle asked about the nature of parking complaints related to ADUs and whether the city requires off-street parking during snow events.

Mr. Goodwin stated that the city code requires two off-street parking stalls for homes, but these often become storage areas rather than being used for vehicles. The city previously required two off-street parking stalls for ADUs, but the state reduced this requirement to one stall.

Mr. Goodwin explained that we do have off-street parking restrictions, especially during wintertime and during storms, if there are cars in the street, it makes it very difficult to plow.

Mr. Lawrence then inquired about transit options in Cedar Hills and whether increased bike usage might help address transportation needs. Mr. Goodwin explained that Cedar Hills has not had a bus stop for approximately 10 years. The previous bus stop near the church was discontinued by UTA due to lack of use. The city currently has no public transit options.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Following public comment, commissioners discussed whether to move forward with the proposed amendment or request additional research from staff. Commissioners requested that staff investigate and return with additional information on the following topics, the feasibility of imposing impact fees for a second ADU, infrastructure capacity impacts of allowing a second ADU, analysis of what would constitute reasonable lot size thresholds for allowing multiple ADUs, review of how other Utah cities handle multiple ADUs per lot, and water and sewer capacity implications

Mr. Goodwin indicated that they would further investigate these items. He noted that any exception for larger lots would likely require rezoning as part of long-term redevelopment.

MOTION: Commissioner Dahl moved to TABLE this item and allow staff to gather additional information on the impact of allowing a second ADU per lot, including data on infrastructure capacity, impact fees, and lot size considerations. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cruze. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cruze- Yes, Commissioner Dahl- Yes, Commissioner Dodge-Yes, Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Open and Public Meetings Training.

Mr. Goodwin presented the annual training on the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act (OPMA), reviewing requirements for transparency in government actions, proper notice, electronic meeting procedures, and standards for keeping meeting minutes. The presentation outlined when meetings may be closed, permissible closed-session topics, required voting procedures, and restrictions on taking final action in closed meetings. Mr. Goodwin also reviewed public notice obligations, emergency meeting protocols, and the penalties and enforcement mechanisms for OPMA violations. Common violations were highlighted, including insufficient agenda specificity and improper closed-meeting procedures.

ADJOURNMENT

7. Adjourn.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas moved to ADJOURN. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dahl. Vote on motion: Commissioner Cruze- Yes, Commissioner Dahl-Yes, Commissioner Dodge-Yes, Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

Approved:
April 28, 2026

/s/ Colleen A. Mulvey, MMC, UCC
City Recorder