



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, July 7, 2026**. Chairman Wallis led the meeting.

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

Staff Present: Justin Lewis (City Recorder), HollyJo Karren (City Administrator), Bryce Wood (City Council Liaison)

Others Present: Josie DeMann, Debbie Zilles, John Watterson

Approval of the June 2, 2026 meeting minutes

*****Mr. Christensen moved to approve the June 2, 2026 Planning Commission meeting minutes as submitted. Ms. Allen seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.*****

Yes Vote: Allen, Christensen, Meacham, Smith, Wallis

No Vote: None

Initial discussion on Ordinance 2026-10, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 200 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)", Chapter 12-800 "Zoning Establishment", Part 12-805-21 "Accessory Dwelling Unit".

Chairman Wallis was absent from the previous meeting but reviewed the minutes and stated the proposed Ordinance appeared to capture the issues discussed. He indicated that the draft was a good starting point.

Mr. Lewis stated that the proposed Ordinance had been sent to the Cache County Building Inspection Department for review. He noted that items from that review were incorporated to help ensure the Ordinance meets applicable codes and requirements. Once the Ordinance is finalized, the department will conduct a final review.

Ms. Allen asked whether the County had provided guidance on a minimum size requirement. Mr. Lewis responded that the County had not issued specific guidance. Staff indicated that the Planning Commission and City Council should determine the appropriate definition of a "tiny home". Staff also noted that this type of development may not be what the City intends to encourage and that the discussion should focus more on the requirements for the various types of allowed accessory dwelling units

(ADUs).

Mr. Christensen recommended adding a purpose statement at the beginning of the proposed Ordinance. He explained that a purpose statement describes the intent of the code and clarifies why it is being written and what goals it is intended to accomplish. He suggested the following language: *Accessory Dwelling Units are intended to expand life-cycle housing opportunities, provide affordable housing options, support aging in place, encourage small-scale incremental development, increase housing diversity while preserving neighborhood character, and make efficient use of existing public infrastructure.*

A. The following standards govern the establishment of one accessory dwelling unit (ADU), whether attached or detached, for the purpose of providing an independent residential dwelling that supports housing diversity, multi-generational living, workforce housing, aging in place, caregivers, or supplemental household income”.

Chairman Wallis stated that affordable housing is an important consideration. He noted that ADUs can help property owners offset mortgage costs through rental income, a key reason for encouraging affordable housing options.

Ms. Allen asked for clarification on the phrase "encourage small-scale incremental development." Mr. Christensen explained that the intent is to promote smaller-scale housing developments within existing neighborhoods rather than large residential complexes. He provided examples, including converting a single-family home into a duplex, developing a small fourplex, or constructing a small apartment building. He added that such developments can provide life-cycle housing options and support the community's long-term needs.

Chairman Wallis stated that ADUs encourage small-scale development.

Mr. Lewis stated that some property owners are currently benefiting from accessory dwelling units (ADUs) without complying with applicable regulations or reporting them. He noted that he recently saw an advertisement for a home that appeared to be offered as an illegal rental. He explained that, from the City's perspective, challenges include determining how and when to enforce compliance and how to provide clear guidance to residents who wish to establish ADUs legally. He added that in this case a home is being offered for rent as a duplex rather than as the single-family home it was built for and is zoned for. He added that this is a widespread issue that will need to be addressed. Mr. Christensen stated that ADUs can provide valuable opportunities without altering a neighborhood's overall infrastructure.

Mr. Christensen stated that there may be three types of ADUs: internal units, detached units, and remodeled additions. He suggested separating these categories for clarity. He also recommended adding the following language to Section 1a(3): "Any remodeling incurred **for the addition of an internal/attached dwelling unit** in this process must be within the footprint of the primary dwelling."

Mr. Lewis stated that, as long as any addition is part of the main structure, the City is

not primarily concerned with how it is completed, provided that it complies with all applicable rules and regulations.

Mr. Christensen recommended adding "a minimum of two (2) parking spaces" to Section 1b. He noted that the sentence currently reads "not to exceed two (2) additional, of any type or combination, of types of vehicles" and said the added language would help ensure parking is provided for those vehicles.

Mr. Lewis said that if detached ADUs are allowed, they will likely require space for more than two vehicles such as a family with a teenage driver. He questioned whether the number allowed matters, as long as there is adequate off-street parking.

Chairman Wallis proposed the following language: "The owner of the residential property shall be responsible for providing adequate off-street space to accommodate all vehicles associated with all occupants, in accordance with this Ordinance." Mr. Christensen agreed with the recommendation, noting that unit sizes and renter needs may vary.

Mr. Christensen noted that short-term rentals (STRs) had been discussed previously. He asked whether an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) could be used as a short-term rental and, if so, whether such use should be limited to a room or a detached unit rather than an entire house. He also recalled that, during prior discussions of the City's STR ordinance, there had been consideration of limiting the number of short-term rentals in a specific area.

Mr. Lewis responded that short-term rentals and accessory dwelling units are separate issues governed by different processes. He stated that any concerns about short-term rentals should be addressed through the City's STR regulations rather than the ADU ordinance. He also reminded the Commission that Richmond City has a small staff, making enforcement challenging. He noted that enforcement efforts would most likely focus on situations where a violation is causing a problem. Mr. Christensen pointed out that if an STR is allowed within an ADU, the property owner would be on-site, which might mitigate potential concerns.

Mr. Christensen suggested adding "*electrical*" to the list of services in Section B.6 that will be connected to the primary building. He also suggested adding the following clarifying sentence: "*Secondary utility meters are permitted but not required.*" Chairman Wallis stated that he did not think electrical service fit within that list, explaining that there may be situations where the existing electrical panel is insufficient and it would be more cost-effective to connect a new electrical service to the ADU, such as on large properties with shops. Mr. Lewis stated that this would not affect the City, did not appear to be a problem, and recommended not including the proposed language.

Mr. Christensen recommended adding language to the second sentence of Section B.7, as shown in bold: "***The height of a newly constructed or remodeled detached dwelling unit shall not exceed the lesser of the height of the roofline of the existing permanent structure or 35 feet. Adaptive reuse of existing garages, barns, or other accessory***

buildings that meet code requirements is permitted." He stated that this would help address situations involving existing structures rather than new construction.

Mr. Christensen stated that at the previous meeting, the Commission discussed scenarios, including Mr. Meacham's shed, which is taller than his home due to the property's topography. He noted that the language would also allow someone to add a second level to an existing barn, garage, or shed.

Chairman Wallis stated that the proposed height limitation depends on how building height is measured. He questioned whether the provision would prohibit a property owner from constructing a taller structure, moving into it, and using the existing home as an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). He also asked whether it would affect the ability to add a second story to a detached structure behind a single-family residence, provided the structure remained within the 35-foot height limit. He further questioned which structure would be considered the primary dwelling in either scenario.

Chairman Wallis suggested removing the phrase "lesser of," setting a maximum height of 35 feet, and referencing the City Code section that defines building height.

Mr. Lewis stated that, if this Ordinance is amended, a resident had also suggested amending the following section: **12-805-6 Area of Accessory Buildings - No accessory building or group of accessory buildings in an individual lot of any residential zone shall cover more than twenty-five (25) percent of the rear yard.**

Mr. Christensen noted a proposed change to Section B.8, as shown in bold: **"A detached dwelling unit shall have a minimum square footage size of 400 square feet, and a maximum square footage to be the lesser of 60 or 75% of the main floor living area of the primary residence (excluding garages, unfinished basements, porches, and other non-habitable spaces), or 1,500 square feet."** Chairman Wallis stated that this language would allow a studio apartment or small mother-in-law space while prohibiting campers and trailers.

Mr. Lewis and Chairman Wallis noted that the proposed language could prohibit construction of a larger structure that might serve as the primary residence, even if the lot is large enough and the structure complies with all applicable setback and height requirements. Mr. Meacham agreed that this type of development should be permitted when the property can accommodate it. Chairman Wallis expressed concern that the proposal could create ambiguity about which structure is considered the primary residence. He suggested that the Ordinance instead reference compliance with all applicable building and zoning requirements to avoid confusion.

Chairman Wallis suggested adding **"excluding ADA use."**

Mr. Christensen suggested adding the following language: "Safe pedestrian access shall be provided between the primary dwelling, accessory dwelling, sidewalks, and parking areas." Mr. Lewis asked whether a sidewalk should be required if a driveway is available, noting that some property owners may not want an additional walkway.

Chairman Wallis said that some owners may want the ADU to feel more separate and private and that he did not think the language should be required.

Mr. Christensen noted that an existing shed may not comply with applicable setback requirements. Ms. Karren explained that a structure may be placed as close as one foot from the property line, provided the roof is designed so that runoff does not drain onto the adjacent property. Mr. Christensen asked whether allowances could be made to address privacy concerns. Mr. Lewis responded that enforcement would be challenging. Chairman Wallis stated that, in his opinion, structures that do not comply with applicable regulations should be rebuilt, relocated, or, where appropriate, attached to the primary residence. Mr. Lewis added that he hoped property owners would also address such issues out of respect for neighboring properties.

The Commission agreed that items such as materials, colors, and architectural style do not need to be defined in this ordinance.

Mr. Lewis stated that the proposed ordinance would be revised based on the Commission's discussion and then brought back for consideration at the next meeting. He noted that the Commission would hold a public hearing and conduct a final review before taking action on the ordinance.

Discussion on public education opportunities for park strip landscaping and tree selection.

Mr. Christensen expressed support for Smithfield City's approach to partnering with Utah State University (USU) and using the university's resources. He stated that the City should take advantage of the research and information already developed.

Ms. Allen agreed and suggested posting information on the City's website, including links to direct residents to USU resources. Ms. Karren noted that this would help staff guide residents who contact the City with questions.

Mr. Smith agreed with the discussion and noted that USU provides valuable guidance on appropriate plant selections. He added that linking to USU's website would help ensure residents have access to up-to-date resources.

Mr. Christensen suggested providing a "welcome packet" to new residents that includes relevant information. He noted that volunteers at the Park Bench might be willing to help assemble the packet as an activity.

Mr. Lewis confirmed that turf grass is allowed. Mr. Christensen expressed concerns about turf, noting that it can become very hot, render the ground impermeable, damage soil, and contain chemicals and microplastics. He stated that it may be more harmful than helpful. Ms. Allen clarified that the discussion applies only to park strip landscaping, not to full yards.

Ms. Allen provided examples of suitable grass products and local suppliers. She stated

that tall fescue is a popular water-conscious option because its deep root system makes it drought-tolerant and suitable for foot traffic. She noted that Anderson Seed & Garden in Logan offers water-wise seed mixes. She also discussed buffalograss, which is highly water-efficient during the warm season and requires little maintenance, though it turns brown in cold weather and is not ideal for walking. She added that Anderson Seed & Garden also offers mixes designed to improve drought tolerance and traffic durability.

Mr. Christensen stated that Turtle Turf is a low-maintenance, drought-tolerant grass developed from Prairie Junegrass, but it grows much more slowly than other grasses.

Mr. Meacham added to Ms. Allen's comments, stating that light-colored rocks are generally best. He noted that lava rock is not ideal for high-traffic areas or for areas near plants. He recommended avoiding sharp rocks or materials that may migrate into the street. He stated that 1/2-inch crushed material generally works well, especially for snow removal. He added that larger rocks can discourage pedestrian traffic and often stay in place better than smaller rocks.

Discussion on the definition of “Animal Unit” in Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)”, Chapter 12-300 “Definitions”
--

Chairman Wallis requested that the language be reviewed and clarified, noting that he recently read through it and found it confusing.

Mr. Lewis agreed and stated that the staff's goal is to rewrite the entire code because the current language is confusing and ambiguous. He noted that enforcement can be challenging when neighbors interpret the regulations differently. Staff will prepare a draft ordinance for review at next month's meeting, giving the Commission an opportunity to provide feedback and discuss any proposed changes before further action is taken.

Mr. Lewis emphasized that the intent is not to remove existing rights for residents who currently have animals. He clarified that the proposed changes would not apply to cats or dogs and that pigs would continue to be addressed through the conditional use permit process. He noted that one issue he would like the Commission to consider is the regulation of roosters, as this is a restriction commonly addressed by many municipalities. Councilmember Wood noted that zoos will accept roosters.

Mr. Christensen suggested having more generalized categories might be helpful.

Josie DeMann stated that most inquiries concern animal units and allowable combinations of animals, because these items are included in the kennel license application. She thanked the Commission for addressing the issue and working toward clearer, more understandable regulations.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting: August 4, 2026

Planning Commission Chairperson



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

AGENDA

Public notice is given that the Richmond Planning and Zoning Commission will meet in a regularly scheduled meeting at 90 South 100 West, Richmond, Utah, on **Tuesday, July 7, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes from June 2, 2026.
2. Initial discussion on Ordinance 2026-10, an ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)," Chapter 12-800 "Zoning Establishment," Part 12-805-21 "Accessory Dwelling Unit."
3. Discussion on public education opportunities for park strip landscaping and tree selection.
4. Discussion and definition of "Animal Unit" in Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)," Chapter 12-300 "Definitions."

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.