



**Kaysville City Planning Commission
Meeting Notice and Agenda**

The Kaysville City Planning Commission will hold a regular meeting on May 28, 2026, at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers of the Kaysville City Municipal Building located at 23 East Center Street. The public is encouraged to attend in person or may view the meeting online via www.Kaysvillelive.com.

1. Welcome and Meeting Order
2. Declaration of Conflict of Interest
3. Conditional Use Permit for an Electronic Message Center (EMC) sign located at 368 North Main Street for Lifetime Dental
4. Rezone request and public hearing for parcel #08-242-0047 at 768 W Christopher Circle from R-A Agricultural Residential to R-1-20 Single Family Residential
5. Approval of the minutes from the May 14, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting
6. Other matters that properly come before the Planning Commission
 - a. Reports
 - b. Correspondence
 - c. Calendar
7. Adjournment

On a Notice of Meeting was posted in accordance with Utah State Code Section 52-4-202 (3).

Kaysville City is dedicated to a policy of non-discrimination in admission to, access to, or operations of its programs, services, or activities. If you need special assistance due to a disability, please contact the Kaysville City Offices at (801) 546-1235 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting to be held.

Mindi Edstrom
Community Development Department

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

To: Kaysville City Planning Commission
From: Anne McNamara, Senior Planner
Date: May 20, 2026


Agenda Item #3: Conditional Use Permit for an EMC sign for Lifetime Dental located at 368 North Main Street.

Meeting Date	May 28, 2026
Application Type	Conditional Use Permit
Applicant Owner	Gina Gentile Godfrey Family Dental Building LLC
Address Parcel ID Number	368 North Main Street 11-364-0003
Lot Size	0.37 acres 16,117 ft ²
Current Use	GC Undeveloped
Conditional Use	Electronic Message Sign (EMC)

1. BACKGROUND

Gina Gentile with Baker Signs is requesting a conditional use permit to allow Lifetime Dental to install an Electronic Message Center (EMC) sign at 368 North Main Street. The applicant had previously applied for a Conditional Use Permit for a similar sign, and that application was approved at the September 28, 2025, Planning Commission meeting. Since that time the applicant has made revisions to the size of the EMC sign which require the item to be brought back before the Planning Commission for approval of the changes. The sign will be placed along the southern property line along Main Street.

The proposed sign is approximately seven feet five inches tall by eight feet eight inches wide with a total square footage of roughly 65 square feet. The square footage of the electronic message center portion of the sign is approximately 36 square feet, or 55% of the total sign size. This represents an approximately ten square feet total increase in the size of the EMC proposed at the September 2025 meeting, which only totaled roughly 27.5 square feet



of EMC. EMC signs are permitted as a conditional use in the General Commercial zone subject to the provisions found in [KCC 17-33](#).

2. ZONING

The property located at 368 North Main Street (Parcel 11-364-0003) is zoned as General Commercial (GC). EMC signs are subject to the regulations found in 17-33-9 which are listed below:

17-33-9 Signs Permitted By Zone

Size: Allowable EMC size shall not exceed 50% of total allowed sign size and not more than 75% of any sign cabinet.

Location: EMC signs shall not cause glare or rapid blinking, nor be intensely lighted so as to create a nuisance or hazard to vehicular traffic, pedestrians, or adjacent properties. EMC signs shall be capable of being programmed to automatically dim according to ambient light conditions. Conditional use in zones where permitted. Allowed only as part of monument and ground signs. As part of the conditional use review the designated Land Use Authority may consider hours of operation, sign height, sign size, and/or setbacks from property lines.

3. SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS & USES

The property is surrounded by primarily commercial uses, with some residential uses, including an assisted living facility to the west and the north.

Adjacent zoning:

- a. To the north of the property are other GC zoned properties, as well as a small segment of R-M multifamily zoning and healthcare zoning property for an assisted living facility.
- b. To the east of the property there is a large number of GC commercial properties extending east towards Crestwood's intersection with Main Street.
- c. To the west of the property are additional commercial GC properties, as well as a cluster of R-4 multifamily zoned units and a few R-1-8 single family zoned lots.
- d. To the south of the property is GC zoned lots extending to the opposite side of Main Street from the property.

4. FINDINGS

The proposed sign meets requirements outlined in 17-33 Sign Regulations and with the following codified provisions, there should not be need for additional conditions:

- a. Setbacks
KCC 17-33-7 provides general sign provisions for what setbacks are applicable. According to KCC 17-33-7 (4) all signs shall be at least eighteen inches from the property line measured from the leading edge of the sign. The applicant's site plan demonstrates compliance with this standard.



b. Lighted Signs

According to KCC 17-33-7(6) all illuminated signs shall not be installed in a location that permits the light to permeate beyond the property in a manner than interferes with adjacent properties. The illumination plans for the sign show compliance with this standard.

c. Maintenance of Signs

According to KCC 17-33-7(9) all signs shall be maintained in a safe presentable condition.

d. Abandonment of Signs

All signs that fail to meet the maintenance provisions provided in KCC 17-33-7(9) will be subject to the requirements of 17-33-7(10) that outline compliance and fee requirements for abandonment of any permitted signs.

5. PUBLIC NOTICING AND PUBLIC COMMENT

A sign was placed on the property on May 22, 2026. As of the date of this report, no comments have been received.

6. RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending approval of this application with any conditions the Planning Commission feel are appropriate based on the standards outlined in [KCC 17-30-8 Conditional Use Standards](#).

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT


To: Kaysville City Planning Commission
From: Anne McNamara, Senior Planner
Date: May 18, 2026

Agenda Item #4: Rezone request and public hearing for parcel #08-242-0047 at 768 W Christopher Circle from R-A Agricultural Residential to R-1-20 Single Family Residential.

Meeting Date	May 28, 2026
Application Type	Rezone
Applicant Owner	Nicholas Racker
Parcel ID Number	08-242-0047
Lot Size	0.64 acres 27,878 ft ²
Current Use	Single Family Home
Current Zoning	R-A Agricultural Residential
Density Entitlement	1 Dwelling Unit
Requested Zoning	R-1-20 Single Family Residential
Density Entitlement	1 Dwelling Unit


1. BACKGROUND

Nicholas Racker submitted an application to rezone property located at approximately 768 West Christopher Circle from [Agricultural Residential \(R-A\)](#) to [Single Family Residential \(R-1-20\)](#). The rezone is requested to allow the property owner to accommodate a planned addition to the rear of the existing home. The requested zone change would reduce the required rear yard setback to 15 feet from the 30 foot setback required for R-A.



2. SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING

- **North** – To the north of the property is a mixture of single family lots including Agricultural Residential and R-1-20 Single Family Residential.
- **South** – To the south of the property is primarily larger lot single family lots that are zoned Agricultural Residential.



- **East** – To the east of the property is a small segment of other lots zoned Agricultural Residential, as well as several Light Industrial lots along Deseret Drive.
- **West** – To the west of the property is a mixture of single family lots including Agricultural Residential and R-1-20 Single Family Residential.

3. GENERAL PLAN

A. FUTURE LAND USE MAP

The future land use map on the 2022 General Plan shows the property at approximately 768 West Christopher Circle to be zoned as single family residential. The R-1-20 zone is designated as single family, therefore this rezone request is supported by the future land use map.

B. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

In examining the guiding principles 2022 General Plan, staff found there are no guiding principles that speak directly to the lot size in existing residential neighborhoods, so the General Plan is considered neutral on this matter.



C. GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES

Staff review of the General Plan believes it supports the zone change proposed.

The setbacks for the R-1-20 are consistent with the existing setbacks (30’ front yard, 8’ side yard, 15’ rear yard) in the surrounding R-1-20 zoned lots, meaning that approval of the rezone would not change the functionality of the surrounding neighborhood. Maintaining this functionality supports Chapter 1 Goal 1 as included in the 2022 General Plan which states that the City should “preserve single family neighborhoods by restricting development to models that fit the existing character of the neighborhood.” The approval of the proposed rezone to R-1-20 would maintain this character and support the continued functioning of the neighborhood as encouraged in the General Plan.

D. CHAPTER 6: KAYSVILLE WATER USE & PRESERVATION

Based on the nature of the proposed rezone application there is zero anticipated additional water consumption. No additional analysis is required at this time.

4. ZONING

The purpose of the R-1 Single Family District, which includes the R-1-20 zoning designation is stated as:

To provide for areas in appropriate locations where quiet, low-density residential neighborhoods may be established, maintained, and protected. The regulations of this district are designed to promote and encourage a suitable environment for families, most of whom will have children. To this end, the regulations permit the establishment of single-family dwellings

and also permit, with proper controls, those public and quasi-public activities such as schools, libraries, churches, parks and playgrounds, which serve the needs of families. The regulations are intended to prohibit the establishment or operation of any activity which would be adverse to such a residential environment.

The proposed R-1-20 zoning requires setbacks of 30' in the front yard, 8' in each side yard, and a 15' rear yard. Buildings must be at least 10' in height and cannot exceed 30'.

The Planning Commission should determine if the purpose statement for the R-1-20 zone is fulfilled in this particular location.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

A total of 49 public notices were mailed to property owners within a 500' radius of the subject property. As of the date of this report, one resident came in to ask about the change in setbacks for the property. A sign was placed on the property on May 21, 2026.

6. RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for approval of the proposed rezone for the parcel at 768 West Christopher Circle from Agricultural Residential (R-A) to Single Family Residential (R-1-20).

The Planning Commission may make a recommendation to the City Council to approve or deny the rezone request.

Kaysville City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
May 14, 2026

The Planning Commission meeting was held on Thursday, May 14, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. in the Kaysville City Hall located at 23 East Center Street.

Planning Commission Members in Attendance: Chair Mike Packer, Commissioners David Moore, Rachel Lott, Jeramy Burkinshaw, and Eries Cornelius

Staff in Attendance: Katie Ellis, Mindi Edstrom, Melinda Greenwood, and Anne McNamara

Public Attendees: City Councilmember Abbi Hunt, Doug Dredge, Liz Jackson, and Christine Richman

1- WELCOME AND MEETING ORDER

Chair Packer welcomed all in attendance at the Kaysville City Planning Commission meeting.

2- DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3- CONSIDERATION OF THE KAYSVILLE CITY CENTER SMALL AREA PLAN DISCUSSION CONTINUED FROM APRIL 23, 2026

Consultant Liz Jackson introduced the revised draft of the City Center Small Area Plan and explained that updates had been made following the previous Planning Commission discussion and subsequent work session with Commissioners Erin Young and Wilf Sommerkorn. She stated that the revisions focused primarily on clarifying language, reducing prescriptive interpretations in certain areas, and further emphasizing that the document is intended to function as a visionary and guiding planning tool.

Ms. Jackson explained that the plan continues to recognize Historic Main Street, Main Street North, and Mutton Hollow as three distinct areas that should remain cohesive as part of the overall city center vision. She noted that one of the recommendations retained in the plan is the future development of area-specific standards tailored to each district to preserve their unique character while maintaining consistency throughout the corridor.

She reviewed several housekeeping updates within the document, including corrections to acknowledgements and typographical errors, as well as updated graphics and photographs intended to better reflect current development patterns and existing site conditions. She also explained that “bottom line up front” summary callouts had been added to sections related to vision principles, transportation, parking, and mobility to provide clearer summaries of the plan’s intent.

Ms. Jackson discussed additional language added to further define “active storefronts” and pedestrian-oriented development. She explained that the revisions were intended to clarify planning terminology and emphasize storefronts with visible entrances, windows, outdoor

seating, and other elements that encourage walkability, activity, and social interaction along Main Street.

The consultant team also incorporated additional discussion regarding public art and placemaking opportunities. Ms. Jackson stated that the revisions emphasized public art as a relatively simple but meaningful way to activate public spaces, support local artists, and reinforce community identity. Examples from other Utah communities were included in the document to illustrate mural programs, utility box art wraps, sculptures, and other public art installations.

Ms. Jackson further reviewed revisions related to Main Street North and Mutton Hollow. She stated that the updated language clarified that the renderings are illustrative only and not intended to mandate specific development types. Additional text was added to emphasize that the priority for these areas is the creation of pedestrian-scale buildings, cohesive street frontage, and walkable development patterns regardless of the specific land use proposed in the future.

Additional revisions were made to further explain concepts related to east-west connectivity and pedestrian access across Interstate 15. Ms. Jackson stated that the plan now includes examples from other communities showing pedestrian overpasses and connections intended to improve bicycle and pedestrian mobility. She noted that these examples were included to demonstrate possibilities rather than specific commitments by the City.

Ms. Jackson also explained that additional visual examples and explanatory text were added for the Mutton Hollow area to better communicate the intended character of the district. She stated that the revisions focused on illustrating concepts such as walkable storefronts, gathering spaces, landscaping, outdoor seating, and pedestrian-oriented design while emphasizing flexibility for future development proposals.

Ms. Greenwood clarified that several of the revisions presented by the consultant team were specifically intended to address concerns previously raised by Commissioner Paul Toller regarding flexibility within the Main Street North and Mutton Hollow areas.

Ms. Greenwood also addressed Commissioner Toller's earlier comments regarding potential vehicular access between Main Street and the City Hall block area. She explained that access from Main Street into the civic block area would likely not be permitted by Utah Department of Transportation due to roadway restrictions and access management requirements. She stated that discussions with the transportation consultant and the City's Public Works Director confirmed that such an access point would be unlikely to ever receive approval from UDOT. Ms. Greenwood further noted that the property represents valuable civic space and that the City would likely not want to compromise that area with additional vehicular ingress and egress even if it were permitted.

Chair Packer stated that he appreciated the revisions and adjustments made to the draft Small

Area Plan and indicated that he felt the updates were well written and adequately addressed prior concerns.

Commissioner Moore also expressed appreciation for the revisions and specifically acknowledged the comments and feedback previously provided by Commissioner Paul Toller. He stated that the consultant responses and clarifications helped address remaining questions and concerns regarding the document.

Commissioner Cornelius stated that he had reviewed the revised draft in detail and appreciated the presentation and updates provided by the consultant team. He noted that the document does not include provisions related to eminent domain, condemnation, forced acquisitions, or mandatory redevelopment. Commissioner Cornelius observed that the plan prioritizes pedestrian safety, bicycle infrastructure, traffic calming, preservation of Kaysville's small-town identity, protection of historic structures, and maintenance of adequate parking. He further commented that feedback collected through surveys and public engagement indicated strong community interest in thoughtful change and improvement within the city center area. Commissioner Cornelius stated that, based on the revisions presented, he felt prepared to move the process forward.

Commissioner Birkenshaw thanked the consultant team from GSBS Consulting for their work on the Small Area Plan and stated that the presentation had been very helpful. He explained that he had not attended the previous meeting and wanted additional clarification regarding the feasibility and market analysis supporting the retail recommendations shown in the conceptual massing plans, particularly in the Mutton Hollow area. Commissioner Birkenshaw expressed concern that the proposed amount of retail space appeared substantial for a location that is not directly connected to a freeway interchange or major arterial corridor. He emphasized that he appreciated the vision presented in the plan but wanted to better understand the long-term market realities behind the recommendations so the City would not create unrealistic expectations for the community or imply that specific retail development would occur within a certain timeframe.

Ms. Richmond responded that the Small Area Plan was intended to function as a long-term visionary document rather than a prediction of immediate development activity or current market cycles. She explained that the analysis focused on long-term development opportunities and future decision-making guidance rather than guaranteeing that particular uses would occur. Ms. Richmond stated that the consultant team recognized the Mutton Hollow property owner was not currently pursuing redevelopment, and any future development would likely occur only when market conditions aligned appropriately. She noted that the plan was designed to provide future city leaders and property owners with a framework for evaluating redevelopment proposals if they arise.

Ms. Richmond further explained that the consultant team did not envision the area as appropriate for large regional "big box" retail development because the site, while visible from Interstate 15, does not have direct freeway-oriented access. Instead, the conceptual plan

focused on destination-oriented retail opportunities combined with residential uses to create a more walkable mixed-use neighborhood environment. She stated that the large size of the property created opportunities for integrated development with residential components and public amenities rather than solely commercial development.

Commissioner Birkenshaw asked whether a formal market feasibility analysis had been completed. Ms. Richmond explained that Jason Clonch from Catalyst Commercial had prepared a long-term economic and real estate market analysis, which was included as an appendix to the Small Area Plan document.

Ms. Jackson stated that the analysis examined regional market opportunities and estimated how much retail demand the Kaysville Main Street area could potentially capture over multiple future market cycles. She emphasized that while future competition from other regional development areas could not be predicted, the consultant team believed the Mutton Hollow area could compete successfully over time if designed with strong walkability, landscaping, and destination-oriented features connected to Main Street.

Commissioner Birkenshaw commented that retail development generally follows residential growth and rooftops, and he expressed concern that Kaysville may not experience substantial additional residential growth in the future to support large amounts of new retail space. He also noted that portions of Main Street already contain significant retail square footage and questioned whether additional retail could realistically be sustained. He clarified that he was not opposed to the vision but wanted to ensure the plan did not unintentionally create expectations among residents that certain major retailers would locate in the city.

Ms. Richmond responded that the recommendations for both Historic Main Street and North Main Street were intended to strengthen the existing commercial areas rather than undermine them. She explained that the plan focused on reinforcing the strengths already present within the community by improving streetscapes, walkability, gathering spaces, and overall aesthetics to encourage additional private investment and community activity. She stated that the recommendations for Historic Main Street centered on enhancing community gathering opportunities around existing attractions such as the theater, ice cream shop, and local restaurants, while recommendations for North Main Street focused on improving the visual continuity and pedestrian experience to better connect it with the historic downtown area. She added that the intent was to encourage quality development and reinvestment rather than additional auto-oriented commercial uses such as car washes.

Commissioner Birkenshaw thanked the consultants for the clarification and stated that he appreciated the focus on reduced setbacks, improved streetscapes, walkability, and outdoor activation spaces.

Ms. Greenwood stated that developers typically conduct their own market analysis before pursuing projects and generally do not move forward with proposals that lack sufficient market support. She explained that while the Small Area Plan identifies opportunities and

enhancement concepts, any future redevelopment would occur gradually over time and in a manner consistent with the community's desire for measured and thoughtful change.

Commissioner Birkenshaw commented that one of the strengths of the plan was that it was not overly prescriptive and still allowed flexibility for future developers to bring forward ideas and visions appropriate for individual properties and market conditions.

Ms. Greenwood agreed and stated that while the Mutton Hollow property has significant visibility from Interstate 15 and substantial acreage, it also presents major development challenges, particularly related to access limitations.

Commissioner Birkenshaw agreed, describing the site as a very challenging property from a development perspective. Ms. Greenwood explained that because of those limitations, the consultant team's suggestion of destination-oriented or experiential uses could potentially be a more appropriate fit for the site. She emphasized that any future development concepts would ultimately depend on the desires of the current property owners and future market conditions, and that the City would carefully evaluate any future proposals when they are submitted. She further noted that the General Plan already identifies the area for mixed-use potential and stated that a carefully planned mixed-use environment could be successful there if designed appropriately and supported by market demand.

Commissioner Lott stated that although she did not have extensive development experience, she felt optimistic about the future potential of the area due to increasing activity generated by the nearby Fairfield development and the new traffic signal in the Mutton Hollow area. She recalled that portions of west Kaysville near the current WinCo Foods site had once been largely undeveloped but had since experienced substantial commercial growth and activity. Commissioner Lott stated that she believed future traffic patterns and regional growth could eventually support additional development opportunities in the area.

Ms. Greenwood also noted that many communities face challenges when redevelopment areas are located along roads controlled by Utah Department of Transportation due to access restrictions and permitting limitations. She stated that one advantage of the Main Street North area in Kaysville is that the roadway north of 200 North is under City control rather than UDOT jurisdiction, providing the City with greater flexibility for future improvements and streetscape enhancements.

Commissioner Moore made a motion to recommend approval of the City Center Small Area Plan to the City Council, including all revisions and modifications discussed during the meeting. Commissioner Lott second the vote and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Yay
Commissioner Cornelius: Yay

Commissioner Burkinshaw: Yay

4- DISCUSSION OF DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

Ms. McNamara introduced a discussion regarding recently adopted state legislation permitting detached accessory dwelling units (DADUs), noting that the law would take effect in early October. She explained that staff wanted to begin discussions early to provide sufficient time for the City to develop a local ordinance prior to the effective date. Ms. McNamara stated that the packet included the state code language along with examples of detached ADU ordinances from other Utah cities for reference.

Ms. McNamara explained that staff reviewed previous Planning Commission and City Council discussions on detached ADUs dating back to 2019 and compiled a list of recurring concerns and discussion topics to assist in shaping a future ordinance. She also presented examples from several Utah cities, including Layton, Bountiful, and Sandy. She noted that Layton differentiates setback requirements between one-story and two-story detached ADUs and includes privacy glass requirements for windows near neighboring properties. Bountiful requires deed restrictions and regulates the placement of doors, staircases, and windows to preserve neighbor privacy. Sandy requires entrances to face side or rear yards and conducts annual inspections to ensure compliance. Ms. McNamara stated that these examples were intended to provide potential concepts for Kaysville to consider while developing its own ordinance. Commissioner Birkenshaw asked whether the City could prohibit detached ADUs from being used as short-term rentals.

Ms. McNamara responded that the state legislation allows cities to require a minimum rental period of 90 days if desired. Ms. Greenwood added that Kaysville already prohibits short-term rentals and stated the intent of the legislation was to provide additional long-term housing opportunities rather than vacation rentals or transient lodging. She explained that many inquiries the City receives regarding detached ADUs involve residents seeking housing options for aging parents or adult children who need independent living opportunities while remaining close to family.

Commissioner Birkenshaw stated that he felt a prohibition on short-term rentals should be included in the ordinance. Commissioner Birkenshaw also asked whether the Public Works Department had expressed any preference regarding separate utility meters for detached ADUs.

Ms. Greenwood stated that Public Works staff did not have a strong opinion on separate metering requirements and explained that there were both advantages and disadvantages to requiring separate utility connections. She noted that installing separate utility meters often requires roadway cuts, which can shorten the lifespan of streets and potentially conflict with the City's pavement cut moratorium policies. Ms. Greenwood explained that City code generally prohibits non-emergency pavement cuts for four years following road resurfacing projects. She further noted that requiring separate utility meters could significantly increase

construction costs for homeowners.

Ms. McNamara added that an influx of detached ADU applications in newer subdivisions could create complications if road moratorium restrictions prevented utility installations.

Ms. Greenwood stated that staff also wanted direction from the Planning Commission regarding whether detached ADUs should require owner occupancy and whether properties should be allowed to contain both an internal ADU and a detached ADU simultaneously. She indicated that her initial impression was that the City Council would likely favor limiting properties to either one internal ADU or one detached ADU, but not both, because allowing multiple accessory units on a single lot could begin to resemble multifamily housing.

Commissioner Lott agreed that permitting multiple ADUs on a single-family lot could create zoning concerns inconsistent with the intent of single-family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Birkenshaw asked about the overall process moving forward and whether staff intended to prepare a draft ordinance following the discussion.

Ms. Greenwood explained that staff hoped to receive preliminary guidance from the Commission during the meeting and then return with a draft ordinance for further discussion and eventual public hearing consideration. She noted that because only five commissioners were present, staff might conduct an additional discussion meeting before proceeding to a formal public hearing process.

Commissioner Lott stated that she supported owner occupancy requirements, limitations on short-term rentals, and restrictions preventing multiple ADUs on a single lot.

Chair Packer stated that he generally agreed with those concepts as well.

Commissioner Birkenshaw additionally expressed concern regarding parking impacts and garage conversions. He questioned whether detached garages should be allowed to be converted into ADUs and whether parking should be required on-site rather than relying on street parking.

Ms. Greenwood explained that state law requires cities to provide a process for converting detached accessory structures into ADUs and noted that garage conversions are already allowed for internal ADUs under current state law. She also explained that recent legislative changes prohibit cities from restricting tandem parking arrangements for single-family homes and townhomes.

Ms. McNamara added that state law limits parking requirements for detached ADUs larger than 650 square feet to no more than two additional parking spaces.

Commissioner Lott stated that she believed detached accessory dwelling units should be

required to provide on-site parking because street parking can become unavailable during winter snow conditions.

Commissioner Birkenshaw agreed that requiring off-street parking was reasonable. Ms. McNamara agreed that off-street parking would help prevent future parking conflicts and winter parking enforcement issues. Ms. Greenwood suggested that parking requirements could potentially vary based on the size of the ADU, such as requiring one parking space for a one-bedroom unit and two spaces for larger units.

Commissioner Birkenshaw stated that he also appreciated provisions included in other city ordinances prohibiting mobile homes, recreational vehicles, and shipping containers from qualifying as detached accessory dwelling units.

Chair Packer agreed that explicitly prohibiting those types of structures would be beneficial. Ms. Greenwood noted that Kaysville already prohibits individuals from living in recreational vehicles under existing city code.

Commissioner Moore commented that restating those prohibitions within the detached ADU ordinance could still provide additional clarity for residents.

Ms. Greenwood stated that one likely outcome of the new legislation would be increased use of prefabricated or modular tiny homes delivered to properties and installed on permanent foundations. She explained that recent state legislation and building code changes have increasingly encouraged alternative housing construction methods, including prefabricated modular units and emerging construction technologies, as part of broader efforts to address statewide housing shortages and affordability concerns. She noted that any such structures would still be required to comply with building code requirements, including permanent foundations.

Ms. McNamara explained that Layton uses increased setback requirements for two-story detached ADUs, essentially doubling the side and rear yard setbacks compared to single-story units to address privacy concerns. She stated that the City could choose to allow multi-story detached ADUs while incorporating additional setbacks or other design standards to mitigate privacy impacts on neighboring properties.

Commissioner Cornelius stated that he appreciated the layout and organization of Layton's ordinance table because it clearly summarized the requirements and would be easy for residents and contractors to understand and follow during the permitting process.

Ms. McNamara agreed and stated that Layton's ordinance format was one of her preferred examples because of its clarity and ease of use.

Mr. Cornelius further commented that he appreciated the ordinance provisions related to setbacks, entrance placement, and window limitations, which he felt helped address neighbor

privacy concerns and created clear design expectations for applicants.

Ms. McNamara indicated that staff would likely incorporate similar organizational features into Kaysville's draft ordinance.

Commissioner Cornelius also asked whether the City could regulate the maximum height of detached ADUs relative to the primary dwelling on the property.

Ms. McNamara responded that state law does allow cities to regulate detached ADU height in relation to the primary dwelling and explained that cities have approached the issue in different ways. Some cities prohibit detached ADUs from exceeding one story, while others allow two-story units with additional setback and privacy standards. She noted that previous discussions within Kaysville had raised concerns regarding privacy impacts associated with taller structures located near property lines.

Commissioner Lott commented that if detached ADUs matched the general scale and setbacks of the primary residence, the impacts on neighbors might not be significantly different from existing residential development patterns.

Ms. McNamara explained that other cities also use limitations based on overall square footage or proportional size relative to the primary dwelling, and she noted that Kaysville has flexibility to select an approach that best fits the community's preferences and existing residential character. She also reminded the Commission that residential zones within Kaysville currently maintain a 30-foot height limitation.

Ms. Greenwood stated that the City frequently receives complaints regarding detached accessory buildings, particularly concerns about excessive height or size in residential backyards. She explained that staff had discussed whether allowing a two-story detached accessory dwelling unit with the same setbacks already permitted for a primary residence could adequately address privacy concerns. She noted that if a primary residence could legally be constructed at two stories with a 15-foot rear setback, it raised the policy question of whether a detached ADU built under the same standards should be treated differently simply because it was detached. Ms. Greenwood explained that Kaysville contains many larger lots, particularly within older residential areas and some R-1-8 neighborhoods, where detached ADUs could potentially fit without significantly impacting neighboring properties. She stated that these considerations remained policy questions for the Commission to evaluate as staff drafted the ordinance.

Ms. Edstrom asked the Commission whether they would personally want a detached ADU constructed in their own backyard or neighboring properties.

Commissioner Rachel Lott responded that she had personally considered constructing a detached ADU on her own half-acre property for her mother. She explained that another nearby resident had constructed a similar unit for a family member and stated that rising

housing costs, concerns regarding elderly independence and care, and the desire to utilize large backyard spaces more productively all contributed to the practical appeal of detached ADUs.

Ms. Greenwood shared an example involving a family member who was constructing a new home to accommodate a widowed mother-in-law. She explained that detached ADUs could provide significant comfort and flexibility for multi-generational housing arrangements and aging family members. She also acknowledged that some residents had expressed concerns about the potential proliferation of detached ADUs throughout the community. However, she noted that construction costs remained substantial and stated that factors such as financial resources, lot size, property configuration, and actual family need would naturally limit widespread development. She further explained that converting existing detached structures into residential units would present additional challenges related to building code compliance, setbacks, and utility requirements, all of which would need to be addressed through the ordinance. Ms. Greenwood stated that the City could initially adopt a relatively simple ordinance and make adjustments over time as the impacts and practical realities became clearer.

Commissioner Birkenshaw stated that unlike the broader city center planning discussions, he believed the detached ADU ordinance should be highly prescriptive to avoid unintended changes to the character of Kaysville neighborhoods. He expressed concern that poorly designed or loosely regulated detached ADUs could significantly alter the appearance and feel of residential areas over time.

Chair Packer agreed that it was important to anticipate potential scenarios and establish clear standards before widespread development occurred.

Ms. Greenwood noted that other Utah cities such as Bountiful and Murray have allowed detached ADUs for several years but historically had not experienced high application volumes, estimating roughly eight to ten applications annually in some communities. She stated that staff planned to contact Farmington to determine how many detached ADU applications they had received since adopting their ordinance in order to better estimate potential demand within Kaysville. Commissioner Birkenshaw responded that he anticipated detached ADUs would likely become more common in the future as housing costs and property values continued to rise. Ms. Greenwood further noted that the State Legislature could potentially expand detached ADU requirements in the future to apply to even smaller residential lots, requiring cities to continue adapting their ordinances accordingly.

Ms. Greenwood summarized several areas where she believed consensus had emerged among the Commission. These included requiring owner occupancy of the primary residence, prohibiting short-term rentals within detached ADUs, limiting properties to one detached ADU, and requiring two off-street parking spaces.

Ms. McNamara added that if the City were to differentiate between one-story and two-story detached ADUs, a clearly organized table similar to examples reviewed from other cities would

likely be helpful for both applicants and staff. She also noted that utility considerations and financial feasibility would remain important factors during ordinance development.

Commissioner Birkenshaw reiterated his support for potentially tying the allowable height of a detached ADU to the height of the primary residence.

Chair Packer responded that such a standard could create unintended limitations on larger lots with older single-story homes, where property owners might reasonably desire a larger detached ADU despite the modest size of the existing residence.

Commissioner Lott suggested that placement of the detached structure on the property could also play a role in mitigating privacy concerns.

Chair Packer expressed concern that tying the size or height of a detached accessory dwelling unit directly to the primary residence could create unintended limitations on larger agricultural or older residential properties. He noted that some older farm homes in Kaysville sit on large lots but consist of relatively small single-story homes, which could make it difficult for property owners to construct reasonably sized detached ADUs if height or size restrictions were based solely on the dimensions of the original residence.

Ms. McNamara responded that the new state legislation specifically allows cities to require detached ADUs to maintain consistency with the design of the primary dwelling. She acknowledged that the language within the legislation was intentionally broad but stated that it appeared to provide local governments with flexibility regarding compatibility requirements.

Ms. McNamara explained that staff would need to evaluate how that provision interacts with existing state limitations on architectural design standards for single-family homes and Commissioner Lott commented that the discussion highlighted the challenge of defining what “consistency” between a detached ADU and a primary dwelling actually means in practice. She referenced a remodeled historic home near the church on Main Street that incorporated significant additions while still maintaining compatibility with the original structure.

Commissioner Birkenshaw expressed concern about maintaining neighborhood compatibility if detached accessory dwelling units were constructed with significantly different materials or architectural styles than surrounding homes. He stated that while some modern materials could be attractive when done well, poorly designed structures with incompatible materials or roof styles could negatively impact neighborhood character.

Commissioner Cornelius asked whether the City could establish minimum and maximum square footage limitations for detached ADUs.

Ms. McNamara responded that state law allows cities to regulate detached ADU size and explained that many Utah cities have adopted different approaches. She referenced Bountiful as an example, noting that Bountiful requires detached ADUs to contain a minimum of 350

square feet and a maximum of 1,250 square feet. Ms. McNamara stated that the legislation intentionally provides cities significant discretion in establishing size limitations, which is why ordinances across Utah vary considerably.

Commissioner Cornelius stated that size flexibility could be particularly important for larger rural or agricultural properties where the primary dwelling may be relatively small but located on substantial acreage. Commissioner Lott agreed that some property owners might reasonably want detached ADUs similar in size to the original residence.

Chair Packer commented that the City would likely want to avoid situations where detached ADUs became significantly larger or more dominant than the primary residence on a property.

Ms. McNamara responded by asking how much consistency the City ultimately wanted to require between detached ADUs and the primary dwelling.

Chair Packer also asked whether detached ADUs would be restricted to rear yards rather than front yards. Ms. McNamara explained that Kaysville's existing code already prohibits accessory buildings within front yards, which would naturally limit detached ADU placement. She noted, however, that additional discussion would still be needed regarding setbacks, placement standards, and whether the City wanted to adopt more restrictive requirements depending on lot size and neighborhood context.

Ms. McNamara stated that more restrictive setback requirements could significantly limit where detached ADUs could realistically be placed on smaller lots.

Ms. Edstrom asked whether the City should allow home occupations or businesses to operate from detached ADUs, particularly in situations where a separate business was already operating from the primary residence. She questioned how the City would handle situations involving multiple business activities on a single property, such as preschools, instructional uses, or swim lesson businesses operating simultaneously between the primary home and the detached ADU. Commissioner Lott asked which dwelling would be considered the primary location for the business activity.

Ms. Greenwood explained that Kaysville's current home occupation regulations already allow multiple businesses on a property so long as the cumulative impacts remain within ordinance limitations, including restrictions on square footage and neighborhood impacts. Ms. Edstrom clarified that minor home occupations currently do not require business licenses because they generate no customer traffic, employees, or neighborhood impacts, and she stated that she could envision scenarios where separate minor home occupations could operate independently within both the primary residence and a detached ADU without issue.

Commissioner Cornelius asked whether certain businesses could eventually transition from minor home occupations into major home occupations if they expanded over time.

Ms. Edstrom responded that some businesses naturally grow beyond the thresholds for minor home occupations, requiring reassessment and potentially additional approvals.

Ms. McNamara asked whether the City had previously received business license applications involving existing internal ADUs.

Ms. Edstrom recalled a previous applicant who wanted to convert a detached accessory structure into a business space while living on the property, but ultimately relocated the business to Farmington because the required modifications became cost prohibitive.

Chair Packer asked whether internal ADUs currently allow business uses, prompting additional discussion regarding how the City should approach future business activity associated with detached ADUs.

Ms. Edstrom referenced the recently approved swim lesson conditional use permits discussed by the Commission at a prior meeting and explained that neighboring residents had recently expressed frustration regarding increased parking activity associated with two separate swim lesson businesses operating from the same property. She noted that while the businesses were legally permitted and public street parking remained lawful, the situation highlighted how cumulative neighborhood impacts could still become a concern even when each individual use technically complied with city regulations. Ms. Edstrom stated that those types of scenarios were important to consider while developing detached ADU regulations and future home occupation policies.

Commissioner Lott continued discussing larger residential properties and stated that she still felt the concept of limiting detached accessory dwelling units to a percentage of the primary dwelling made sense in many situations. She noted that property owners on large lots already have alternative options available, such as expanding the existing home or subdividing the property if zoning and lot configuration allow. Commissioner Lott expressed concern about creating detached ADU standards that unnecessarily overlap with existing subdivision and zoning provisions already available within city code.

Ms. Greenwood responded that subdivision possibilities vary significantly depending on zoning classifications, frontage requirements, and lot configurations. She explained that while some properties may be capable of subdivision or rezoning to smaller lot standards, other properties may lack sufficient frontage or physical layout to satisfy subdivision requirements. Ms. Greenwood noted that factors such as flag lot access widths and minimum lot size standards would continue to limit subdivision opportunities for many homeowners.

Commissioner Lott stated that one of her concerns was the difficulty in anticipating how detached ADUs may evolve over time, particularly if they become more common in future years. Ms. Greenwood agreed that forecasting long-term impacts remains challenging but noted that construction costs continue to remain high and may naturally limit widespread detached ADU development. She stated that while detached ADUs may gradually become more

attainable over time, they are still likely to remain relatively expensive investments for most homeowners.

Ms. Edstrom raised an additional question regarding existing detached accessory structures already located on residential properties. She asked how the City would handle situations where a homeowner already has a large detached accessory building in the backyard and later wishes to retrofit the structure into a detached ADU. Ms. Edstrom questioned whether those existing structures would be required to fully comply with all new setback, height, and conversion standards as part of the conversion process.

Ms. Greenwood explained that the new state legislation specifically requires cities to establish a conversion process for existing detached accessory structures. She stated that the City would need to determine how flexible or restrictive that process should be, particularly regarding setbacks, height, privacy concerns, and building orientation. Ms. Greenwood suggested that one possible approach could involve allowing certain nonconforming existing structures to be converted if the residential portion of the ADU is oriented toward the primary residence rather than neighboring properties. However, she also acknowledged that the City Council may ultimately prefer a simpler approach requiring all converted detached ADUs to fully comply with current setback and development standards.

Ms. Greenwood informed the Commission that staff hoped to present a draft detached ADU ordinance to the City Council sometime in August to allow sufficient time for review, revisions, and adoption before the state legislation becomes effective on October 1, 2026.

Chair Packer asked whether the City's zoning ordinance currently limits the percentage of a residential lot that may be covered by structures and questioned how detached accessory dwelling units would factor into those calculations.

Ms. Greenwood explained that Kaysville's current detached accessory building ordinance does contain lot coverage and setback limitations but acknowledged that portions of the ordinance are written in a confusing manner that is difficult for both residents and professionals to interpret. Ms. Greenwood stated that architects and designers frequently contact City staff seeking clarification regarding how the existing code should be applied. She noted that staff anticipates amending and simplifying the detached accessory building ordinance in conjunction with the new detached ADU ordinance to create a more understandable and user-friendly format.

Commissioner Lott suggested organizing the regulations into a table format for easier interpretation.

Ms. Greenwood agreed and stated that staff had already created an internal "cheat sheet" table to help interpret the current ordinance and anticipated using a similar tabular format within the revised ordinance to improve clarity for residents, applicants, and staff. She added that staff would need to carefully ensure that any detached ADU regulations remain consistent

with the City's broader accessory building standards and do not inadvertently conflict with other portions of the zoning code.

Ms. McNamara added that several residential zoning districts within Kaysville already contain additional ADU-related limitations that would also need to be reviewed and potentially amended as part of the detached ADU ordinance update process. She stated that staff would need to reconcile those existing provisions with both the new state legislation and the revised accessory building standards, acknowledging that the ordinance update process would involve substantial additional work.

Commissioner Lott asked whether the Commission had provided sufficient direction for staff to begin preparing a draft ordinance.

Chair Packer thanked staff for compiling background information and ordinance examples from other Utah cities, stating that the comparative materials had been very helpful in framing the discussion and identifying potential approaches for Kaysville to consider moving forward.

5- APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM MAY 14, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Commissioner Moore made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 14, 2026, Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Cornelius seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Commissioner Packer: Yay
Commissioner Sevy: Yay
Commissioner Moore: Yay
Commissioner Cornelius: Yay
Commissioner Burkinshaw: Yay

6- OTHER MATTERS THAT PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Greenwood informed the Planning Commission that staff had recently received a significant number of new rezone applications. Ms. Greenwood explained that City received additional rezone requests involving individual residential properties. One application proposed rezoning a single parcel from R-8 to R-1-20 in order to reduce setback requirements and allow an addition to an existing home. Another application proposed rezoning a property from R-1-20 to R-4 to facilitate the addition of multiple residential units on the site. Ms. Greenwood indicated that the applicant believed the property size could potentially support four units, although the initial proposal involved two additional units.

Ms. Greenwood further reported that staff had recently received a rezone application for the former Sunset Equestrian Center property requesting rezoning to R-1-6 residential zoning. She anticipated that the application would likely be scheduled for the June 25 Planning Commission meeting and stated that staff planned to place the item on an agenda by itself due to the anticipated level of public interest and comment. Ms. Greenwood noted that this would be the fourth major proposal involving property in that area during her tenure with the City and

expected many of the same neighborhood concerns and public comments previously raised to reoccur during the hearing process.

Ms. Greenwood also provided an update regarding the proposed Presbyterian Church redevelopment project. She stated that staff had recently transmitted a draft development agreement to the applicant and the project would likely be scheduled for the June 11 Planning Commission meeting. She stated that the proposal currently consists of ten townhome units arranged in two five-unit buildings, along with three commercial buildings, including a proposed conversion of the existing church building into commercial space. She further explained that another commercial structure would front Center Street while an additional building would be located toward the rear of the property. Ms. Greenwood stated that her understanding was that the applicants had met with nearby neighbors and that neighborhood feedback appeared to be more supportive of the revised proposal compared to an earlier version that had previously been denied by the City Council in the fall.

Ms. Greenwood concluded by informing the Commission that staff would continue providing copies of future public hearing notices and rezoning materials to commissioners as applications progress through the review process. Chair Packer remarked that the City appeared to be entering an especially busy period involving numerous rezoning applications and public hearings.

7- ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Lott made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 pm.