

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Tuesday, June 23, 2026 6:00 p.m.
Civic Center
3925 N Cedar Hills Drive, Cedar Hills, Utah

Present: Vice Chair Steve Thomas, Presiding
Commissioner Tyler Dahl (arrived at 6:07 p.m.)
Commissioner Troy Newbold
Commissioner Robert Wallace

Absent/Excused: Commissioner Bari Cruze
Commissioner Jeff Dodge

Staff: Sarah Sampson, Associate Planner
Colleen Mulvey, City Recorder

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

1. Call to Order.

Vice Chair Thomas called the meeting to order at 6:03 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 April 28, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Newbold moved to **APPROVE** the Meeting Minutes from the April 28, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wallace. **Vote on motion:** Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes, Commissioner Wallace-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Review/Recommendation and Public Hearing on amendments to City Code Title 10-5-5(B)(3) related to Rear Setback Areas.

Associate Planner, Sarah Sampson, presented the proposed amendments. She noted that this item was previously addressed in April with regard to side setback areas, but the rear setback area portion had been missed and was now being brought back for consideration. The 2021 International Swimming Pool and Spa Code updated the barrier requirements for swimming pools and spas, allowing for specific safety covers and low fences or walls in the barrier. The proposed amendments bring the City Code into alignment with the adopted ISPSC code by prohibiting barriers in rear setback areas, similar to the prohibition already approved for side setback areas.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas moved to recommend APPROVAL to the City Council the proposed amendments to City Code 10-5-5(B)(3). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Newbold. Vote on motion: Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes, Commissioner Wallace-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Review/Recommendation and Public Hearing on amendments to City Code Title 10-5-26 related to Signs.

Associate Planner, Sarah Sampson, presented the proposed amendments. She explained that House Bill 33 passed in the 2026 legislative session and became effective May 6th.

The updates include several key provisions. The City must designate a location where removed temporary signs can be kept for safekeeping. The City must make reasonable attempts to contact the sign owner within 2 days of removing a sign. The amendments allow temporary signs to be placed in park strips adjacent to a property if the property owner is required by ordinance or agreement to maintain that park strip, essentially treating it as an extension of their own property.

Ms. Sampson stated that the House Bill specifically designates this information for political signs, but we decided to open it up to all temporary signs so that we are not having to decide if the sign is political or not, it is just a temporary sign. This approach would apply to business advertisements, political signs, and any other temporary signage.

Ms. Sampson next provided a detailed review of the proposed code changes: Section 10-5-26.4A: the city has traditionally allowed public property to be used as an open public forum. The code removes the "temporarily non-commercial signage" wording and adds that "signage in such areas shall be regulated in a content-neutral manner and may be subject only to reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions."

Section F5: striking some language and adding that "any sign that meets the definition of a temporary sign is regulated as a temporary sign regardless of the message," ensuring that temporary signs are not reclassified as permanent signs based on content.

Section G on temporary signs: "Temporary signs shall be regulated without regard to the content," with this wording coming directly from state code requirements.

Section G4: temporary signs shall not be prohibited in a park strip if: (A) the poster of the sign is the owner or lawful occupant of the property adjacent to the park strip, and (B) is required by local ordinance or agreement to maintain the park strip, or (C) obtains consent to post the sign from the person described in the section above.

Ms. Sampson noted a typographical error in Section G4B that would be corrected, changing "is required be local ordinance" to "is required by local ordinance."

Regarding removal of signs: The notice period for regular permanent signs remains 15 days. The notice period for temporary signs is being increased from 3 to 5 days, giving property owners more time to address signs placed where they are not permitted.

Ms. Sampson explained that the code requires notification within 2 days, with signs held for 5 calendar days. A reasonable effort must be made to notify sign owners. Staff must designate a specific location for sign storage (currently city offices) and must notify the owner of the sign where it was removed from and where it can be retrieved.

The amendments also update code references to reflect changes in state code, changing references from UCA 10-9a to UCA 10-20.

Vice Chair Thomas asked about the 5-day destruction period, and Ms. Sampson confirmed this complies with the new state requirements, down from the previous 7 day holding period.

Vice Chair Thomas 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 10-5-26 with the typographical correction. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wallace. Vote on motion: Commissioner Dahl-Yes, Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes, Commissioner Wallace-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

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

Associate Planner, Sarah Sampson, presented the proposed amendments. She noted that this proposed code was reviewed at the last meeting in April and was now being presented as the officially proposed code. House Bill 284, which passed in the most recent legislative session, requires changes to the City Code for compliance.

She explained the following key provisions of the new state law: Cities are now prohibited from requiring a conditional use permit for accessory dwelling units (ADU); only a registration is permitted. Detached ADUs of 650 square feet or larger require two off street parking spaces, while ADUs of 649 square feet or smaller require one parking space. Cities can prohibit detached ADUs from being larger than the main dwelling. She noted that this provision is not currently included in the proposed code being considered.

Cities can prohibit detached ADUs from being placed in the front yard, limiting them to rear and side yards only. Cities can prohibit ADUs if the unit cannot connect to adequate utilities that are part of the project. Cities can prohibit detached ADUs from being rented for less than 90 consecutive days. Cities can limit properties to only one ADU per lot.

Ms. Sampson then reviewed the proposed code changes to Section 10-5-32. The conditions and criteria section removes the conditional use permit requirement and replaces it with a registration requirement, maintaining the existing \$40 registration fee. Language was struck that was repetitive. A new Section L was added stating that separate utilities are not allowed and prohibiting more than two utility services.

Parking requirements were added based on square footage: 2 spaces for ADUs 650 square feet or more, and 1 space for ADUs 649 square feet or less. Language regarding registration and paying fees was struck from one section as it was redundant with other sections.

A provision was added limiting properties to 1 ADU per lot. A previous provision stating "a maximum of one accessory dwelling unit per single-family home" was struck because the limitation to one ADU was added in an earlier section, making the later reference redundant.

Commissioner Dahl noted that there were still references to "apartments" in the code rather than "accessory dwelling units." Ms. Sampson acknowledged this issue and committed to changing all references from "accessory apartment" to "accessory dwelling unit" throughout the code.

Vice Chair Thomas asked about the \$40 fee structure and whether the city attorney had reviewed it. Ms. Sampson responded that the attorney may not have specifically reviewed it with the new legislation changes, but the fee has not changed from what was previously required.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Newbold moved to recommend APPROVAL to the City Council the proposed amendments to City Code 10-5-32 with the following conditions: that the word "apartment" is replaced with "accessory dwelling unit" throughout the code, and that the city attorney review the fee structure.. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dahl. Vote on motion: Commissioner Dahl-Yes, Commissioner Newbold-Yes, Commissioner Thomas-Yes, Commissioner Wallace-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Vice Chair mentioned that to accommodate the needs of staff, it was decided to move the next month's meeting to July 14th.

ADJOURNMENT

7. Adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Approved:
July 14, 2026

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