



RICHMOND CITY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

City Council Chambers
90 South 100 West
Richmond, Utah 84333

The Richmond City Planning & Zoning Commission met in a regularly scheduled meeting at 90 South 100 West, Richmond, Utah, at 6:30 p.m. on **Tuesday, June 2, 2026**.

Cache Christensen chaired the meeting.

Commission Members Present: Cindy Allen, Cache Christensen, Brock Meacham, Todd Smith

Commission Members Absent: Brent Wallis

Staff Present: Justin Lewis (City Recorder), HollyJo Karren (City Administrator)

Others Present: Jay Bair, Debbie Zilles

Approval of the May 5, 2026 meeting minutes

*****Cindy moved to approve the May 5, 2026, Planning Commission meeting minutes as submitted. Brock seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Allen, Christensen, Meacham, Smith

No Vote: None

Absent: Wallis

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)", Chapter 12-3000 Permitted Use Matrix".

This proposed ordinance will add "Tattoo/Piercing Studio/Shop" to the Permitted Use Matrix. A line was added to the Matrix for "Warehousing and Storage (Excluding Storage Units)", and storage units were added on the next line; this will allow them to be located where they have been in the past, in the section of the City Code, which is in MLI (Manufacturing/Ligh Industrial) via a Conditional Use Permit.

6:32 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Jay Bair asked whether tattoo and piercing services would be permitted in certain commercial settings. Cache stated that the intent is to allow these uses, similar to in-home salons—microblading and aesthetic practices—with a limitation of one chair serving one customer at a time.

6:34 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion on possible vote on Ordinance 2026-04.

*****Todd moved to recommend approval to the City Council for Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)”, Chapter 12-3000 Permitted Use Matrix”. Brock seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.*****

Yes Vote: Allen, Christensen, Meacham, Smith

No Vote: None

Absent: Wallis

Initial discussion on whether or not to allow Detached Accessory Dwelling Units. State Code requires we allow internal but does not mandate detached.

Cindy thanked Cache for compiling information for the Commission's review and consideration.

Justin explained that the primary issue is whether the City wants to allow detached Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in Richmond. Because detached ADUs are not required under Utah state law, the decision rests with the municipality. If the City chooses to allow them, the Commission must determine which standards and parameters to include in a draft Ordinance. He emphasized that the discussion was preliminary and that no final decision or vote would occur during the meeting.

General Discussion

Brock expressed support for detached ADUs, noting their potential benefits to the community, particularly during the current housing shortage. He emphasized the importance of developing a well-structured and consistent Ordinance.

Cache agreed, stating that detached ADUs are among the most common housing-related questions he receives from residents.

Cindy supported proactively creating an Ordinance before state law potentially mandates regulations. She suggested requiring owner occupancy and prohibiting short-term rentals.

Height Restrictions

Cache supported allowing flexibility in ADU heights based on specific parcel characteristics while remaining within the City's maximum height limit of 35 feet.

Justin noted that most cities do not permit ADUs to exceed the height of the primary residence.

Cindy favored a uniform standard that would be easier to administer and enforce. Brock suggested allowing ADUs to match the existing roofline. He explained that varying topography may allow a detached structure to be taller without exceeding the visual height of the primary residence.

Cache expressed concern that taller structures could impact neighboring properties' privacy and suggested increased setbacks as a possible solution.

Justin reminded the Commission that any requirements adopted must be manageable for staff to review and enforce.

Utility Connections

Justin raised the question of whether ADUs should have separate utility connections or be connected to the primary residence.

Todd asked whether homeowners could choose their preferred option. Justin explained that requiring utility connections to the primary residence could help prevent illegal lot splits and would be the staff recommendation.

Justin also noted that detached ADUs would require approval from the Fire Department.

Parking Requirements

Todd suggested requiring at least two off-street parking spaces for detached ADUs.

Size Limitations

Justin asked whether an ADU could be larger than the primary residence when a large lot contains a relatively small home, provided all other requirements are met. He noted that a homeowner could potentially move into a larger ADU and rent out the original residence.

Number of ADUs

Cache emphasized the importance of limiting properties to one ADU, whether attached or detached.

Brock agreed that the Ordinance should clearly establish this limitation.

Architectural Standards

Todd questioned whether detached ADUs should be required to match the appearance of the existing home. Cache responded that such requirements could be difficult to administer and suggested that ADUs comply with existing development standards.

ADUs vs. Duplexes

Cache asked how detached ADUs would be distinguished from duplexes. Justin acknowledged that the distinction can be difficult and suggested that owner-occupancy requirements may help differentiate the two. HollyJo noted that the County recently reviewed and denied a similar situation.

Fees and Registration

Cache asked whether ADUs should require a fee in addition to the standard application process. HollyJo expressed a preference for an annual fee despite acknowledging potential enforcement challenges. Justin noted that annual fees could create complications when ADUs are occupied by family members, such as children or grandparents.

Utility Rates and Water Usage

Cache confirmed that the City's utility structure includes 10,000 gallons of water in the base rate, which appears higher than many neighboring communities. Justin stated that most cities use a lower base rate and that staff would not recommend a separate utility rate for ADUs.

Cache suggested reviewing the City's billing structure to account for ADUs and potentially encourage more efficient water use.

Justin observed that ADUs often result in less yard area and, in many cases, lower overall water consumption.

Ordinance Development

The Commission identified several issues that should be addressed in any future draft Ordinance:

- ✓ Owner-occupancy requirements
- ✓ Prohibition of short-term rentals
- ✓ ADUs will be allowed in residential zones: A-10, A-5, RA-1, RA-2, RLD, and RMD. They will not be allowed in MLI or Commercial/Business zones.
- ✓ Fire Department review and approval that it meets all applicable requirements.
- ✓ Height and setback standards. Size limitations relative to the primary residence roofline, not to exceed 35 feet maximum. Maintain current side setbacks.
- ✓ Utility connection requirements (Provide checklist)
- ✓ Parking requirements of two (2) off-street spaces are required.
- ✓ Hard pack surface required for driveway to detached unit.
- ✓ Size limitations relative to the primary residence roofline.
- ✓ Limitation of one ADU per property/parcel.
- ✓ Architectural and design standards – must meet all current residential construction standards.

Action Items

Staff will draft an Ordinance addressing the key issues identified during the discussion. for review at next month's meeting, with a tentative public hearing in August. No further action was taken, and no vote was held.

Initial discussion on what to allow in the park strip in new subdivisions.

Justin noted that water conservation remains a significant concern and that staff is seeking guidance from the Commission on park strip requirements for new future developments. He clarified that any changes considered would apply only to new developments and would not affect existing park strips.

Justin explained that the Commission should consider whether to maintain current standards or adopt additional restrictions. While trees in park strips are beneficial in concept, they are often difficult and costly to maintain. If not properly trimmed, trees can interfere with utility vehicles such as garbage trucks and snowplow trucks and damage sidewalks. He noted that park strips provide safety benefits and utility corridors but otherwise serve a limited functional purpose.

Tree Placement and Maintenance

Cache asked whether there is a rule prohibiting trees in park strips, noting that restrictions on trees appeared in agreements signed by property owners. HollyJo explained that trees are not prohibited by ordinance; however, the City generally discourages their placement in park strips. She noted that enforcement is limited due to staffing constraints.

Cindy supports trees but agreed they should not be planted in park strips.

Justin noted that maintenance responsibilities vary among municipalities. Some cities require adjacent property owners to maintain park strips and any trees located within them. He pointed out that removing large trees can be expensive and impose a financial burden on homeowners and the city.

Park Strip Design Considerations

Cindy asked about minimum park strip widths and referenced the narrow strips in the City Creek subdivision.

Justin explained that the City evaluates each development based on site-specific conditions. He noted that Johnson View was approved without a park strip because including them would have resulted in excessively steep and unusable driveways. In the Knolls area, significant grade changes also influenced design decisions. The City, with assistance from the City Engineer, considers topography and other site conditions when determining what is appropriate.

Cache expressed concern about eliminating park strips, noting that they provide a buffer between pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles. He also stated that park strips help store winter snow and keep sidewalks clear. Justin agreed that some form of park strip is generally preferable.

Landscaping and Plant Materials

Cache suggested developing a list of approved trees suitable for park strip planting. He also proposed collaborating with local nurseries to provide educational materials and potential discounts to residents.

Cache noted that tree trunk barriers may help protect sidewalks from root damage. Cindy expressed concern that such barriers could negatively impact the health and longevity of trees.

Brock pointed out that improperly maintained trees can create visibility hazards for drivers and noted that this was a significant issue in the community where he previously lived.

Brock also observed that drought-resistant grass varieties and decorative gravel landscaping can provide attractive alternatives to traditional turfgrass.

Cindy suggested that waterwise landscaping materials should be subject to height restrictions.

Cache agreed and stated that landscaping should not be permitted to encroach onto sidewalks.

Justin noted that many cities require vegetation to be maintained with a minimum clearance of 8 feet above sidewalks and 14 feet above roadways.

Public Education and Resources

Cache emphasized the importance of helping residents make informed landscaping decisions. He encouraged the City to provide information regarding appropriate plant materials and available waterwise landscaping programs.

Justin referenced the Utah Water Savers rebate program administered by the State as a resource available to residents.

Brock stated that he is not opposed to grass in park strips but would prefer drought-resistant varieties.

Cache also suggested exploring creative uses for park strips, such as benches or other community-enhancing features, and offered to research additional ideas.

Maintenance Concerns

Todd stated that maintenance and aesthetics are among his primary concerns.

Justin noted that maintenance becomes especially difficult when park strips are located behind vinyl fencing behind the residence, as homeowners are often unwilling to access those areas for upkeep. These lots have double frontage meaning frontage on the front and rear of the property.

HollyJo added that the City faces challenges in maintaining such areas due to limited resources and competing priorities.

Commission Direction

Following the discussion, the Commission agreed that improved public education would be more effective than drafting a new ordinance or amending the City Code at this time.

Cache indicated that the library could assist by providing educational materials, classes, and resources.

Staff agreed to distribute information through multiple channels, including newsletters, the City website, social media, and other public outreach efforts.

Action Items

- Staff will develop and distribute educational materials regarding park strip, landscaping and maintenance.
- Staff will provide information on waterwise landscaping options and available rebate programs.
- Cache will explore additional creative uses and design concepts for park strips.
- Educational information will be shared through newsletters, the City website, social media, and community resources.
- No ordinance changes or code amendments will be pursued at this time.

Assignments

- ✓ Cache will research information on appropriate trees and other possible creative options.
- ✓ Cindy will research grasses and non-vegetative options
- ✓ Brock will look at rock designs
- ✓ Todd will research appropriate plants and shrubs.

This will be discussed further next month to compile information for residents.

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting: July 7, 2026

Planning Commission Chairperson



**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION
90 SOUTH 100 WEST
RICHMOND, UTAH 84333**

AGENDA

Public Notice is given that the Richmond Planning & Zoning Commission will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 90 South 100 West, Richmond, Utah, on **Tuesday, June 2, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 P.M.

Call to Order

1. Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from May 5, 2026.
2. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-04, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)", Chapter 12-3000 "Permitted Use Matrix".
3. Discussion on possible vote on Ordinance 2026-04.
4. Initial discussion on detached accessory dwelling units.
5. Initial discussion on landscaping in the park strip in new subdivisions.

Adjournment

*****Items on the agenda may be considered earlier than shown on the agenda.*****

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations for this meeting should contact the City Office at (435) 258-2092 at least three (3) days before the meeting.