

MINUTES OF THE DRAPER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2026, IN THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PARTICIPATING: Andrew Adams, Chair
Lisa Fowler, Vice-Chair
Commissioner Member Kendra Shirey
Commission Member Susan Nixon
Alternate Commission Member Laura Fidler
Alternate Commission Member Joshua Best

NOT SITTING: Commission Member Christine Green

EXCUSED: Commission Member Mary Squire
Commission Member Gary Ogden

STAFF: Jennifer Jastremsky, Community Development Director
Todd Draper, Planning Manager
Nick Whittaker, City Planner
Maryann Pickering, City Planner
Lori Stout, Executive Assistant
Brien Maxfield, City Engineer
Traci Gundersen, City Attorney
Spencer DuShane, Assistant City Attorney

6:30 PM Business Meeting

Chair Andrew Adams called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM.

1. Items for Commission Consideration.

- A. Action Item: Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 12, 2026.**
(Administrative Action)
Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 12, 2026
- B. Action Item: Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 26, 2026.**
(Administrative Action)
Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for March 26, 2026.
- C. Action Item: Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for April 23, 2026.**
(Administrative Action)
Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for April 23, 2026.

Motion: Commissioner Nixon moved to APPROVE the March 12, 2026, March 26, 2026, and April 23, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, as presented.

Second: Commissioner Fowler seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		
Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

D. Action Item: Johnson I-ADU Deviation Request (Administrative Action)

On the request of City Point Real Estate LLC, representing Melissa and Scott Johnson, a Deviation from strict compliance with the geographical restrictions for I-ADUs for approximately 0.63 acres located at approximately 13164 S. City Point Cv. Known as Application 2026-0095-VAR. Staff Contact: Nick Whittaker, 801-576-6522, Nick.Whittaker@draperutah.gov.

City Planner, Nick Whittaker, presented the staff report and displayed the vicinity, aerial, land use, and zoning maps. The property is designated Residential Low-Medium Density and zoned RA2. The home was under construction, and the proposed Internal Accessory Dwelling Unit (“I-ADU”) was included in the building plans. However, the subject property was in an I-ADU-prohibited area, and, as such, a deviation was requested for its construction. The site plan and elevations were reviewed. The proposed I-ADU would be on the main floor and have its own entrance and two-car garage.

Mr. Whittaker reported that per DCMC §9-31-055, the Planning Commission may approve a deviation from strict compliance with the geographic restrictions of the I-ADU Map upon finding:

1. The lot or parcel on which the primary dwelling is located is at least 6,000 square feet;
2. No Detached ADU (“D-ADU”) exists on the property;
3. The proposed I-ADU meets all requirements of §§ 9-31-030 and 9-31-045 including other applicable requirements of this chapter; and

4. At least two parking stalls meeting the requirements of § 9-31-045(B)(2) are provided for use by occupants of the I-ADU.

Staff review determined that all criteria had been met.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Fowler, Community Development Director Jennifer Jastremsky reported that the Prohibited Areas Map was based on street width. The thought was that if the road was so narrow that it did not allow for on-street parking, the area may not be appropriate for an ADU. The deviation process requires a second parking space to alleviate that concern.

Commissioner Nixon noted that the 20-foot rear yard setback for the ADU was measured on an angle. Ms. Jastremsky reported that setbacks are measured from the property line to the structure. Mr. Whittaker added that building plans had been submitted and would be reviewed for compliance.

Ben Norman of City Point Homes spoke on behalf of the applicant and stated that they had no plans to rent the I-ADU, as it was intended for family use.

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to APPROVE the Deviation request from strict compliance with the geographical restrictions for I-ADU's, as requested by City Point Real Estate LLC, representing Melissa and Scott Johnson, Application 2026-0095-VAR based on the following Findings and the Criteria for Approval as listed in the staff report dated June 2, 2026.

Findings for Approval:

1. The lot or parcel on which the primary dwelling is located is at least six thousand square feet (6,000 ft²);
2. No D-ADU exists on the property;
3. The proposed I-ADU can meet all of the requirements of sections 9-31-030 and 9-31-045, including other applicable requirements of this chapter before issuance of an ADU permitted; and
4. At least two (2) parking stalls meeting the requirements of 9-31-045(B)(2) shall be constructed and provided for use by occupants of the I-ADU.

Second: Commissioner Shirey seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		

Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

**E. Public Hearing: Skaggs Catholic Center Farm to Table Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Requests.
(Administrative Items)**

On the request of Joe Colosimo, representing Skaggs Catholic Center, a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit requests to develop a property as a garden/farm that is ancillary to the schools that are part of the Skaggs Catholic Center for approximately 0.91 acres located at approximately 235 East Kimballs Lane. Known as Applications 2025-0208-SP and 2025-0207-CUP. Staff contact: Maryann Pickering, (801) 576-6391, maryann.pickering@draperutah.gov.

City Planner, Maryann Pickering, presented the staff report and displayed the vicinity, aerial, land use, and zoning maps. The property is designated Residential High Density and zoned R3.

The request included two applications:

1. A conditional use permit to operate a private school in the R3 Zone, which a recently approved Text Amendment allow as a conditional use in the zone.
2. A site plan to prepare the vacant lot owned by the applicant for agricultural use with planting boxes, trees, crops, and flowers.
 - o A small greenhouse may be added in the future.
 - o All crops will be utilized by the school lunch program.

The site plan was reviewed. All crops, planter boxes, etc., will be behind the existing fence. The planned greenhouse location was also indicated on the plan.

Ms. Pickering reported that a recommended condition of approval would limit lighting hours to mitigate any potential issues with neighbors. No comments were received in response to notices about the item.

The applicant, Joe Colosimo, reported that they would comply with the condition requiring the lights to be turned off between 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. They were excited to begin planting crops.

Commissioner Nixon asked if there would be summer classes. Mr. Colosimo reported that there would be summer camps where children would learn skills like transplanting tomatoes.

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

Motion: Commissioner Shirey moved to APPROVE the Conditional Use Permit, as requested by Joe Colosimo, representing the Skaggs Catholic Center, LLC, Application 2026-0070-USE, based on the Findings and Conditions of Approval listed in the Staff Report dated June 2, 2026.

Findings for Approval:

1. The application is in harmony and it is in compliance with the objectives and requirements of the City's General Plan and this title;
2. The suitability of the specific property is appropriate for the proposed use;
3. The proposed use or facility will not be injurious to potential or existing development in the vicinity;
4. The aesthetic impact of the proposed facility or use will not have an impact on the surrounding area;
5. There are safeguards proposed or provided to ensure adequate utilities, transportation access, drainage, parking, loading space, lighting, screening, landscaping, open space, fire protection, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation;
6. There are conditions of approval provided to prevent noxious or offensive emissions such as noise, glare, dust, pollutants and odor from the proposed facility or use; and
7. The impact of the proposed facility or use on the health, safety, and welfare of the City, the area, and persons owning or leasing property in the area will be addressed with conditions of approval.

Second: Commissioner Nixon seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		
Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				

Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

Motion: Commissioner Nixon moved to APPROVE the Site Plan, as requested by Joe Colosimo, representing the Skaggs Catholic Center, LLC, Application 2026-0040-SP, based on the Findings and Conditions of Approval listed in the Staff Report dated June 2, 2026.

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposal represents development of the entire site at one time.
2. With the imposed conditions, and approval of a parking deviation, the Site Plan conforms to applicable standards set forth in Title 9 of the DCMC, including but not limited to, building heights, setbacks, access points, parking, landscaping, and building materials.
3. The proposed development plans meet the intent, goals, and objectives of the General Plan and the purpose of the zone district in which the site is located.
4. The public facilities and services in the area are adequate to support the subject development, as required by engineering standards and specifications.
5. The proposed development plans comply with the engineering standards found in Titles 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, and 18 of the DCMC, including traffic, storm water drainage, and utilities concerns.

Second: Commissioner Fidler seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		
Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

F. Public Hearing: Steeplechase Phase 2 Amended Subdivision Plat Request. (Administrative Item)

On the request of Daanish Hoda, Saba Hoda, and the Steeplechase HOA, an Amended Subdivision Plat for approximately 0.86 acres, located at approximately 13229 South Springdale Way, known as Application 2025-0295-SUB, Staff Contact: Todd Draper, (801) 576-6335, todd.draper@draperutah.gov.

Planning Manager, Todd Draper, presented the staff report and displayed the vicinity, aerial, land use, and zoning maps. The application involved two properties designated Residential Low-Medium Density and zoned RA2, with a Hillside Sensitive Overlay.

The current and proposed Steeplechase Phase 2 Subdivision Plats were reviewed. Parcel D was designated open space with public utility and Draper Irrigation Company easements. The proposed change would amend the lot line between Parcel D and Lot 44. All easements would be relocated, and Lot 44 would become Lot 172. A geotechnical survey discovered a fault line on the property, and required setbacks from the fault were indicated on the plat. Site photographs were displayed.

Mr. Draper reported that public comments were received via email and forwarded to the Planning Commission. One concern was in regard to trail access, but there would be no impact on the trail.

The applicant, Daanish Hoda, stated that he had owned the lot for four years and had taken considerable time to ensure everything was done correctly. The site and plans had been reviewed by a geotechnical engineer, and Draper WaterPro had submitted a letter of approval. No trail access would be affected. The triangular lot shape hampered their ability to install a retaining wall, and the lot line adjustment would correct that issue.

Chair Adams opened the public hearing.

Victor Wells lives across the street from the subject property. He indicated that the information in the notice was unclear and asked for more time to review the potential impacts. He believed that there should be a demonstrated public benefit for removing the easement, and allocating HOA property to a single private property owner was against the public interest. The HOA property belongs to everyone, and he did not know whether the sale had been presented at the meeting, so HOA members could speak to the issue. Easements exist for a reason, and there was no clear communication about how the easement changes would affect the culvert. The infrastructure and easement existed because of a major storm in the early 2000s that blew boulders down the street. HOA open space and easements should not be incorporated into a private lot without compelling public interests, as it establishes a precedent that could encourage similar requests throughout the subdivision. The burden of proof should be on the applicant to demonstrate that the proposal would create no adverse impacts on the HOA assets, drainage systems, trails, easements, and neighboring properties. He asked the Planning Commission to deny the application.

Lance Conrad stated that the public notice indicated that the change would affect all of Parcel D, which surrounds his lot, but his understanding from the presentation was that nothing beyond the culvert would be impacted. He agreed with Mr. Wells that the application came as a shock, but

his prepared comments may not apply, as the lot line adjustment might not affect his property as much as he previously thought. However, he believed the HOA needed to discuss and vote on the proposal, and they had not had adequate time to do so.

Heather Pulley lives near the subject property. Homeowners had received limited information, and she had only heard about the proposal earlier in the day. She asked for more information because she did not understand how HOA land could go to a single homeowner or how that would be in anyone's best interests. She was also concerned about the easement.

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

City Engineer Brien Maxfield reported that there was a fire in the area in 2008, followed by a storm that caused erosion, debris flows, and other issues. The grouted channel was constructed to protect the subdivision and to convey runoff. Staff had reviewed the proposal, and the channel will function as designed as long as it is not undermined, damaged, or encroached upon.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fowler, Mr. Maxfield clarified that Mr. Hoda's planned lot improvements were separate from the channel. A retaining wall will make his lot more buildable, but will not benefit the City.

A photograph of the grouted channel was displayed. Chair Adams noted that the boulders were cemented in place and asked if the channel had corrected the issue. Mr. Maxfield stated that the channels constructed after the 2008 mudslide had worked as expected, and the vegetation had regrown.

Chair Adams asked about resident concerns regarding the HOA. From the aerial map, it appeared that the property owner and the HOA were engaged in a land swap. Mr. Draper reported a 90-square-foot difference in favor of the property owner. The HOA was a party to the application and would be required to sign the plat if the amendment was approved. Notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property 12 to 14 days prior to the hearing. They were also posted on the property and City website. The Staff Report and supporting documentation were posted online with the Meeting Agenda.

In response to a question from Commissioner Shirey, Mr. Draper clarified that the City was not responsible for notifying all HOA members and could not consider internal HOA issues. It was confirmed that no trail access would be affected, and the land swap did not affect public access or easements.

Mr. Draper identified easement locations on the Subdivision Plat. The easements exist on the entire HOA parcel and include open space, public utility, and irrigation easements. The same easements will be added to the new HOA parcel and subtracted from Mr. Hoda's parcel. Public utility easements along the existing property line will be relocated to follow the new property line.

In response to a question raised by Chair Adams, Mr. Draper identified the fault line and noted that it was not included on the original plat as it was discovered through the applicant's geotechnical investigation of the property.

Commissioner Fowler asked how Mr. Hoda worked with the HOA. Mr. Hoda reported that a portion of the culvert that was on his lot would be given to the HOA. He initially approached the HOA about allowing access to Parcel D to construct a retaining wall. That request was denied, but they suggested that the lots could be modified. He then approached the City about potential solutions. Ms. Jastremsky indicated that the amount of open space could not change. They then discussed a land swap to maintain the intended amount of open space. He and the HOA then reached an agreement.

In response to a question from Chair Adams, Mr. Hoda stated that the channel was present when he purchased the lot approximately four years previously.

Ms. Jastremsky reported that the home will be set back 50 feet from the fault line. Chair Adams noted that the newly acquired property would not add to the building envelope due to the increased setback. Ms. Jastremsky clarified that the buildable envelope would increase slightly.

Commissioner Fowler favored approval, as the land exchange would make the lot more buildable and protect the community's channel.

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to APPROVE the Amended Subdivision Plat, as requested by Daanish Hoda, Saba Hoda, and the Steeplechase HOA for the Steeplechase Phase 2 Amended Subdivision Plat, Application 2025-0295-SUB based on the following Findings for Approval and the requirements and conditions listed in the Staff Report dated June 2, 2026.

Finding for Approval:

1. There is good cause for the vacation or amendment, and no public street or municipal utility easement has been vacated or amended.

Second: Commissioner Shirey seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		
Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

**G. Public Hearing: Fox Landing Phase 3 Subdivision Plat Amendment and Full Boundary Line Adjustment Request.
(Administrative Item)**

On the request of Tom Spencer of Wright Homes, representing Wright Homes, and Peter and Kimberly Huber, a Subdivision Plat Amendment and Full Boundary Line Adjustment to add one lot and reconfigure two lots adjacent to the newly created lot and a boundary line adjustment with the property to the east for approximately 1.18 acres located at 773 W. Osborne Vista Way. Known as Applications 2025-0042-SUB and 2025-0180-SUB. Staff contact: Maryann Pickering, (801) 576-6391, maryann.pickering@draperutah.gov.

Ms. Pickering presented the staff report and displayed the vicinity, aerial, land use, and zoning maps. The parcels are designated Residential Medium Density and zoned R3 and RA1.

The item consisted of two applications to be reviewed together: a full Boundary Line Adjustment between the Huber property and Wright Homes, and an amended Fox Landing Phase 3 Subdivision Plat. A portion of the Huber property was sold to Wright Homes, and the remaining parcel will remain outside of the subdivision. The land newly acquired by Wright Homes will be added as a lot in Fox Landing 3, and lots to the north and west will also be adjusted so that all lots meet the minimum standards for frontage, size, width, and depth. Current and proposed Subdivision Plats were reviewed, and it was reported that, per State law, the Boundary Line Agreement must be recorded prior to amended plat recordation.

Ms. Pickering reported that one phone call was received from a neighbor who questioned what would occur at the public hearing.

Commissioner Nixon stated that the minimum lot width for the zone is 80 feet, but the plat showed a curved length of 56.11 feet at the front of the lot. Ms. Pickering clarified that the minimum lot frontage is 50 feet. Lot width can be measured either at the front or rear of the property, and the parcel had adequate width at the rear.

The applicant, Tom Spencer, reported that the application was to add one lot to Fox Landing. They attempted to acquire the parcel seven years ago, but the property owner did not want to sell. They had now reached an agreement. He indicated that there was a typographical error on page 138 of the staff report; the land was acquired from the property to the east, not the west, as indicated in the report.

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

Motion: Commissioner Shirey moved to APPROVE the Full Boundary Line Adjustment, as requested by Tom Spencer of Wright Homes, for the Fox Landing Phase 3 Subdivision Plat Amendment, application 2025-0180-SUB, based on the following Findings for Approval and subject to the requirements as listed in the Staff Report dated June 2, 2026.

Findings for Approval:

1. The proposal submitted to the City includes all necessary information;
2. The record of survey shows no evidence of a violation of a land use regulation;
and
3. The plat amendment corresponding with the proposed full boundary adjustment has been approved in accordance with Section 17-9-020.

Second: Commissioner Fowler seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		
Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

Motion: Commissioner Shirey moved to APPROVE the Subdivision Plat Amendment, as requested by Tom Spencer of Wright Homes, for the Fox Landing Phase 3 Subdivision Plat Amendment, Application 2025-0042-SUB, based on the following Findings for Approval and subject to the requirements as listed in the Staff Report dated June 2, 2026.

Finding for Approval:

1. There is good cause for the amendment, and no public street or municipal utility easement will be vacated or amended.

Second: Commissioner Fidler seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		
Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X

Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

**H. Public Hearing: Rohr D-ADU Text Amendment Request.
(Legislative Item)**

On the request of Ellen and Bob Rohr, a Zoning Text Amendment to Chapter 9-31 of the Draper City Municipal Code (DCMC) to allow existing accessory structures and buildings to be converted into Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (D-ADUs), known as Application 2026-0051-TA, Staff Contact: Todd Draper, (801) 576-6335, todd.draper@draperutah.gov.

Mr. Draper presented the staff report and indicated that the proposed Text Amendment was in response to a citizen-submitted application and not initiated by the City. If approved, the proposal would:

- Permit existing accessory buildings and structures to be converted into D-ADUs;
- Set different height and setback standards for D-ADUs that are created from existing accessory buildings and structures; and
- Clarify where a D-ADU can be located on a property.

The proposed amendments to DCMC §9-31-040: D-ADU Development Standards were reviewed. On the staff's recommendation, the definition of existing structures included a cutoff date and read:

B. Existing Structures: *An existing detached accessory structure, which existed prior to September 21, 2021, can be converted as part of an application for the creation of a D-ADU in compliance with all other standards for D-ADUs listed in this chapter.*

Height and setback requirements would be split into two categories: new structures would follow existing standards, and converted accessory buildings would follow the standards for accessory buildings outlined in § 9-10-040. Converted D-ADUs can also be located in side yards.

Commissioner Fowler asked for examples of the types of accessory dwellings that could be converted with the change. Mr. Draper reported that it could be a garage, shed, barn, or pool house that complies with accessory building setbacks.

Chair Adams stated that some lots have an old bungalow on the property, and in the past, the workaround was to build a breezeway between the structures. One property in the City has a bungalow in front with a large home being built behind it. It is a corner lot, so the front yard could face the cul-de-sac or Carlquist Drive. Mr. Draper clarified that the example would still need a breezeway because the bungalow is in the front yard.

Commissioner Fowler asked if there were any risks to approving the Text Amendment. Mr. Draper reported that the staff did not have information on all buildings that would be eligible for

conversion or their condition. However, the structure would have to comply with building codes and all other ADU requirements.

Chair Adams stated that the structure must still meet required setbacks. Ms. Jastremsky clarified that under the proposed text amendment, the structure would need to comply with accessory structure setback and height requirements. For example, a detached garage requires 10-foot side and rear setbacks and may have a maximum wall height of 15-feet and a peak roof height of 25-feet. A D-ADU must meet the same setbacks as the primary dwelling. On a 0.50-acre lot, a 12-foot side and 20-foot rear setback would be required. ADUs can be up to 35 feet in height. As proposed, the structure could be closer to the property line but should be lower in height.

It was noted that the Text Amendment would allow ADUs to be built much closer to the property line. However, it could also create the opportunity for low- and middle-income housing. Mr. Draper indicated that if a structure under 200 square feet in size was converted into a D-ADU, it could be at the property line but would have a maximum height of 12-feet. However, converting a small structure into an ADU would be difficult.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Nixon, Mr. Draper confirmed that a new D-ADU could be the same height as a home. Commissioner Nixon stated that the ADU should be an accessory use and, therefore, have a lower maximum height. Ms. Jastremsky clarified that the current code allowed D-ADUs to be up to 35-feet in height, and the proposal did not change that standard. Mr. Draper noted that the current standard had been moved within the section but had not been otherwise modified. Other standards require the ADU to be smaller than the main home. The underlying principle was that if the house could be extended by the same height and width, a D-ADU should be allowed in the same space.

The applicant, Ellen Rohr, stated that their existing detached garage is suitable for conversion to an ADU, but it has a different setback from the main house. She was not the only resident in that situation; there were many detached garages in Draper that would be suitable for ADUs. In their case, the structure is a large shop that meets all other code requirements but would have to be moved or significantly deconstructed to meet setback requirements. They researched standards for surrounding cities and found that Draper is an anomaly; those cities have the same 10-foot setback requirement for both detached garages and ADUs. She hoped to update the policy to address D-ADUs and provide clear guidelines for converting an appropriate structure into an ADU.

In response to a question from Chair Adams, Bob Rohr stated that the current shop is a rectangular shape and approximately 15-feet tall. It was built three years previously and met all requirements at the time. The City has strict requirements for a building permit, so someone cannot just turn their pool house into an ADU. They had found that 10 surrounding communities require only a 10-foot setback, and Salt Lake City requires only 7-feet if the height is lower. Current ADU development standards also did not address conversions. In response to a follow-up question, Ms. Rohr confirmed that the structure's height would not change. One side will remain a garage, and the other side will be converted into an ADU. Their intention is to age in place by moving into the ADU and having their son and his family move into the house.

Commissioner Fidler stated that the ADU process would likely take on a life of its own. There are people like the Rohrs who want to age in place, and others, like the application earlier in the meeting, who would be more of a casita. She expected to see more such applications, especially on larger parcels.

Chair Adams asked if a property owner would be allowed to build an ADU above an existing detached garage. Mr. Draper stated that under the current ordinance, a second-story ADU could be built above a detached garage if it met setback and height requirements. Ms. Jastremsky added that existing structures can only have 15-foot-tall walls and a maximum peak height of 25-feet. Chair Adams stated that many homeowners would be opposed to removing their garage but may want to add affordable or family housing above it. He saw a house in Mapleton with a one-bedroom apartment above a detached two-car garage, and he believes people in Draper would want to do something similar. It likely only had a 10-foot setback, and the home was brand new. He questioned whether the Text Amendment went far enough. Commissioner Nixon remarked that structurally, it is not easy to add a second level onto a garage.

Ms. Jastremsky reviewed DCMC §9-10-040(A)(b):

- b. Accessory buildings over 200 square feet shall:
 - 1) be located behind the front wall plane of the main building.
 - 2) Be a minimum of 10 feet from the property lines.
 - 3) Not exceed 25 feet to the peak of the roof.
 - 4) Exterior walls may not exceed 15 feet.

A converted garage could have a second-story ADU, but it would require dormer windows and a steeper roof pitch.

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

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Rohr ADU Text Amendment, as requested by Ellen and Bob Rohr, Application 2026-0051-TA, based on the following Findings and the Criteria for Approval listed in the Staff Report dated June 2, 2026.

Findings for Approval:

- 1. The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan;
- 2. The proposed amendment is appropriate given the context of the request, and there is sufficient justification for a modification to the development codes;
- 3. The proposed amendment will not create a conflict with any other section or part of the development codes or the General Plan;

4. The potential effects of the proposed amendment have been evaluated and are determined not to be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare and represents an overall community benefit; and
5. The proposed text amendment implements best current, professional practices of urban planning, design, and engineering practices.
6. The proposed text amendment brings the text of the DCMC into compliance with State Code.

Second: Commissioner Nixon seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams			X		
Fowler	X				
Squire					X
Nixon	X				
Shirey	X				
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate				X	
Best, Alternate	X				

2. Other Business.

A. Coordination between City staff and the Planning Commission (as needed).

Ms. Jastremsky reported that there had been two City Council meetings since the Planning Commission last met, one of which was devoted to the budget. In the other meeting, the Nielson Rezone was approved. The Veranda West Master Area Plan and Text Amendment were also approved. The Council discussed the Planning Commission's concerns regarding water usage, and the developer was better prepared for the discussion.

3. Adjournment.

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to ADJOURN.

The meeting adjourned at 7:57 PM.