

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, April 28, 2026
Civic Center
3925 N Cedar Hills Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Tyler Dahl, Presiding
Commissioner Jeff Dodge
Commissioner Steve Thomas
Commissioner Robert Wallace

Absent/Excused: Commissioner Bari Cruze
Commissioner Troy Newbold

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 March 24, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallace moved to **APPROVE** the Meeting Minutes from the March 24, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dodge. **Vote on motion:** Commissioner Dahl-Yes, Commissioner Dodge-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes, Commissioner Wallace-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Review/Action and Public Hearing on the Preliminary Plan for Monson Farms Residential Subdivision, located in the Rr-1-20,000 Rural Residential Zone.

Associate Planner, Sarah Sampson, presented the preliminary plan for Monson Farms, a proposed one-lot subdivision located at approximately 3965 West 9820 North located in the RR-1-20,000 zone and consists of 0.99 acres.

Ms. Sampson explained that the proposal includes installation of curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the frontage along 4000 West. The lot is situated between properties on each side. Engineering review was ongoing. The applicant would be required to connect only to Cedar Hills utilities for sewer, water, pressurized irrigation, and stormwater.

Ms. Sampson clarified that this was not a subdivision creating multiple lots, but rather the recording of an official plat for a single lot that had never been formally platted with the county. This formal platting is necessary for the property owner to obtain a building permit.

A sewer lateral runs the length of the lot and extends to serve the lot to the north. An easement would be established to maintain access to this sewer line. Ms. Sampson noted that the zoning requirements for the RR-1-20,000 zone include a 30-foot front setback and 25-foot rear setback, with side setbacks of 18 feet minimum, or 10 feet on one side and 14 feet on the other side, totaling 24 feet.

Chair Dahl opened the public hearing.

Pleasant Grove resident David Rubert stated he lives immediately south of the subject lot. He asked whether the proposed sidewalk installation would extend further than the current asphalt and whether it might impact his driveway.

Mr. Goodwin explained that the required right-of-way is 62 feet from back of sidewalk to back of sidewalk across the street, measured 31 feet from centerline of the road. The improvements would only extend along the frontage of the subject lot, from the southern property line to the northern property line and would not extend onto adjacent properties. He noted that 4000 West is classified as a collector road on the UDOT functional class map, making it a major road for collecting traffic, and securing the right-of-way is essential as development occurs.

Mr. Rubert asked about the sewer lateral location. Ms. Sampson clarified that the existing sewer lateral runs through the property with a 20-foot easement. Mr. Rubert expressed concern about whether grading changes might affect his property, noting a slight grade from bottom to top of the lot.

Mr. Goodwin explained that proposed grading shown by solid contour lines must be contained on the existing property and should not affect adjacent property grades. Staff is committed to working with the engineer to ensure grading does not impact neighboring properties.

Mr. Rubert noted the presence of a large green utility box and underground power lines in the area that had been installed approximately four years earlier when he built his home. He indicated that power lines run underground through a corner of the subject lot. Mr. Goodwin acknowledged this information and explained that when projects like this proceed, utility companies get involved to ensure utilities remain within easements where they can be accessed, and utilities are relocated if necessary. Mr. Goodwin noted that the new approval process allows the Planning Commission to approve preliminary plans, with final plans approved administratively by the city engineer and building and zoning department after all engineering issues are resolved.

Mr. Rubert also asked about the condition of 4000 West, describing it as potentially the worst road in Utah County and asking whether there were plans to repair it.

Mr. Goodwin explained that there are jurisdictional complexities with 4000 West. He displayed a jurisdictional map showing that the Cedar Hills-Pleasant Grove border in this area has an unusual configuration. He explained that even though portions of 4000 West are now in Cedar Hills jurisdiction, Pleasant Grove owns the entire road. Cedar Hills cannot repair or improve Pleasant Grove-owned roads until ownership is transferred. He said that work is ongoing with Pleasant Grove to transfer ownership of these roads. He added that fixing 4000 West properly would be a major project, estimated to cost approximately \$6 to \$7 million, and the project would need to address water service issues.

Cedar Hills resident Deborah Salzman, identified herself as new to the area, having moved from the East Coast where extensive building was occurring. Ms. Salzman asked how many homes or condominiums would be in the subdivision.

Ms. Sampson clarified that this is a single-house lot. The RR-1-20,000 zone requires each lot to be at least 20,000 square feet (approximately half an acre). The lot as currently configured cannot be divided into smaller lots and still meet zoning requirements.

Ms. Salzman asked whether there are restrictions on square footage of homes or height. Ms. Sampson responded that height restrictions exist, set at 35 feet by city code, but square footage restrictions were eliminated by state legislation approximately one year ago, which removed the city's ability to regulate minimum square footage requirements. Ms. Salzman asked whether this would be a single-family home, and staff confirmed it would be single-family residential use only.

Cedar Hills resident Kay Fugal said she lives north of the subject lot and asked for confirmation that the zoning would remain RR-1-20,000 and would not change. Ms. Sampson confirmed this and explained that zoning, like city boundaries, must be contiguous without islands of different zones. Creating one lot as an island of a different zone would not meet state requirements. Any zoning change would require a very large area to be rezoned, essentially requiring the entire neighborhood to change.

A question was asked about whether animals would be allowed and whether that would require additional city approval. Ms. Sampson explained that the RR-1-20,000 zone is the rural residential zone, which allows a designated livestock area. Property owners can have two large animal units (equivalent to four horses) but must dedicate 10,000 square feet to an agricultural area, which cannot be front yard or side yard but must be a dedicated corral area. This is a permitted use within the zone.

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

The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns from Commission members, there were none.

MOTION: Commissioner Wallace moved to APPROVE the preliminary plan for the Monson Farms Residential Subdivision, subject to the condition of engineering review and approval and review and approval of site plan grading. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dodge. Vote on motion: Commissioner Dahl-Yes, Commissioner Dodge-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes, Commissioner Wallace-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Discussion on amendments to City Code Title 10-5-32 Related to Accessory Dwelling Units.

Planning Associate, Sarah Sampson Staff presented information on Utah Senate Bill 284, titled Local Land and Water Modifications, which was proposed and passed during the 2026 legislative session. She explained that SB 284 is significant land use legislation that mandates that cities allow detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) statewide. Cities may no longer restrict detached ADUs and may not require a conditional use permit for detached ADUs in residential zones. This affects how Cedar Hills code is currently written, as the city currently requires all ADUs to be approved by conditional use permit. The code must be revised to allow ADUs by registration rather than conditional use permit.

Commissioner Thomas asked whether this removes set-aside areas that previously existed in high-density zones where ADUs were not available. Mr. Goodwin responded that the city can still designate a certain percentage of residential area within the community as non-applicable for ADUs, referencing the PD-1 zone where Cedar Canyon Subdivision is located.

Ms. Sampson continued explaining the legislation's requirements:

Parking Requirements: Detached ADUs of 650 square feet or more require two parking spaces. ADUs of 649 square feet and under require only one parking space. The city code must be updated to reflect these requirements.

Five Permitted Prohibitions: The new legislation provides five specific aspects that cities are permitted to prohibit regarding detached ADUs:

1. Cities can prohibit detached ADUs from being larger than the main home. Staff commented that this makes sense, stating, "If its nature is accessory, it should not be larger than the main home."
2. Cities can prohibit more than one ADU per lot or parcel, limiting properties to just one ADU. Staff noted that extensive discussion occurred on this topic at the previous meeting. Research within the state found only two cities that allow two ADUs per lot: Hurricane and Moab, both of which have heavy restrictions requiring the ADUs be used for employees working seasonal jobs in those cities. Every city in Utah County currently prohibits more than one ADU per lot.
3. Cities can prohibit detached ADUs from being located in front yards. Staff indicated this aligns with existing city policy, as current ADU code states that ADUs cannot change the look of single-family residential neighborhoods, and having an ADU in the front yard would clearly change that character.

4. Cities can prohibit detached ADUs from being rented for less than 90 consecutive days, effectively preventing their use as short-term rentals and limiting them to long-term rentals.

5. Cities can prohibit detached ADUs if the unit does not have adequate access to utility services or if utilities do not have the capacity to support the detached ADU.

Commissioner Thomas raised concerns about infrastructure capacity, particularly regarding sewer laterals. He noted that newer laterals are larger, but original infrastructure built 30 years ago may not support significant additional capacity for incoming or outgoing flows. He asked whether engineering reviews consider pipe size and pressure when reviewing ADU applications, or whether they simply approve applications that meet code requirements.

Mr. Goodwin responded that the city monitors infrastructure capacity regularly, explaining that every few years the city must complete a sewer capacity report examining flows and pipe sizes to ensure adequate capacity for effluent. Mr. Goodwin acknowledged this is a significant concern for the city, particularly if multiple ADUs per lot were allowed. Mr. Goodwin explained the financial implications of infrastructure upgrades. If ADU proliferation required upsizing a sewer main for example, from 10 inches to 12 inches the cost would be in the millions of dollars.

Mr. Goodwin explained that typically, cities fund utility service line upgrades through impact fees paid by new development, as new growth creates the impact requiring infrastructure expansion. Impact fees fund upsizing of sewer lines, water mains, pressurized irrigation lines, and road infrastructure improvements. However, where this is connected to an ADU, we are not collecting impact fees. So the funds are being paid by the city as a whole.

Mr. Goodwin stated that allowing accessory dwelling units provides a way for the city to comply with the state's moderate-income housing requirements. Without ADUs, there is difficulty with the majority of options on the state's requirements, which are geared towards communities that have a lot of growth. They are not geared towards communities that are not growing and this limits Cedar Hills' options for compliance. He said the city can continue to adjust the ADU code and must make changes required by state law, such as parking requirements for detached ADUs. He noted that most requirements apply specifically to detached ADUs, with internal ADUs retaining more flexibility. Staff recommends restricting properties to one ADU per lot.

Ms. Sampson stated that the goal of our ADU code is not to prevent property owners from using their land, but to ensure that individual decisions do not create collective impacts on the city that neighboring residents and ourselves have to absorb. Staff then asked the Commission for feedback on the desired approach to code amendments.

Chair Dahl summarized the five permitted restrictions:

1. Prohibit detached ADUs from being larger than the main building.
2. Prohibit more than one ADU per lot.
3. Prohibit detached ADUs from being in front yards.
4. Prohibit detached ADUs from being rented for less than 90 consecutive days.
5. Prohibit detached ADUs if there are inadequate utility services.

All Commission members present indicated agreement with implementing all five permitted restrictions .

Ms. Sampson acknowledged the feedback and indicated the next version of the code would include extensive revisions with red lines. She noted that conditional use permit requirements must be removed along with other changes but expressed confidence that the code could still work for the city, meet moderate-income housing requirements, and encourage ADUs appropriately.

ADJOURNMENT

6. Adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Approved:
June 23, 2026

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