



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, August 4, 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: Terrie Wierenga, Eric Maughan, Bryan Kendrick, Kimara Andersen, Lane Andersen, Wade Parrish, Juliene Parrish, Scott Pratt, Debbie Zilles

Approval of the July 7, 2026 meeting minutes

*****Commissioner Smith moved to approve the July 7, 2026 Planning Commission meeting minutes as submitted. Commissioner Christensen seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.*****

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

No Vote: None

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-12, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Number 09-057-0002 from RLD (Residential Low Density) and HC (Highway Commercial) to HC (Highway Commercial). The parcel is located at approximately 250 West 100 South and is approximately 1.9 acres.

Mr. Lewis explained that Eric Maughan purchased a portion of Loy Jean Wertman's property. Mr. Maughan owns the property to the east of this, which is currently zoned HC. The portion he purchased is zoned RLD, and he is requesting that the split-zoned parcel be rezoned to HC in its entirety.

6:31 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Kimara Andersen expressed concern about the potential impact of the proposed zone change on children's safety in the area. She questioned why additional heavy equipment would be needed on the back roads and asked whether access to the property would change or be affected.

Chairman Wallis stated that although he was not familiar with all the business reasons behind the request, he understood why additional acreage might be needed as a logical expansion of the business. He clarified that a zone change would not affect access to the property. He also encouraged Mrs. Andersen to review the zoning section of the City Code, which defines the uses permitted within each zoning district, noting that commercial uses are not allowed in the RLD zone.

Commissioner Christensen explained that materials cannot be stored on the property while it remains residentially zoned. He added that if the property were developed, the owner would be required to complete the appropriate approval process and comply with all applicable development requirements. He emphasized that the current discussion concerns only the requested zoning change.

Wade Parrish, owner of the property to the west and bordering Rocky Mountain Landscape Products, stated that Mr. Maughan had previously purchased property from him and had always been easy to work with. He noted that Mr. Maughan had constructed walls around the work area and had made accommodations as needed. Mr. Parrish assumed the existing entrance and exit would remain unchanged and observed that fewer children are living in the area than in the past. He voiced no objection to the proposed zone change.

Eric Maughan stated that before purchasing the property, he discussed his plans with Mrs. Wertman, who had no concerns at the time. He said he intends to continue the existing 6-foot concrete block wall along the property and does not plan to use the access along 300 West. He reiterated his commitment to keeping people and equipment away from Mrs. Wertman's backyard, minimizing dust, and maintaining a positive relationship with neighboring residents.

Lane Andersen commented that Mr. Maughan has been a good neighbor and has treated nearby residents fairly; however, he expressed concerns about the presence of large equipment and stockpiles of materials. He stated that he would like to see the business continue to coexist with the surrounding neighborhood. He noted that the operation functions more as a commercial operations yard than as a retail business. While there have been no noise complaints to date, he suggested that noise should be considered and questioned whether this is the appropriate time to approve a zone change.

6:44 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-12.

Chairman Wallis thanked the residents for their thoughtful comments, noting that public input is always a valuable part of the decision-making process.

Commissioner Christensen stated that the proposed zone change appears to be a good fit and commended Mr. Maughan for operating his business in a manner compatible with the surrounding area. He said the focus should be less on zoning and more on

ongoing management and mitigation of potential nuisances. He also noted that directing large vehicles to exit onto 100 South is preferable to having them enter the highway before reaching appropriate speeds. He recalled a fatal accident near Maverik several years ago, emphasizing that traffic safety is an important consideration.

Chairman Wallis noted that the business is already an established part of the neighborhood. He places significant value on private property rights and generally supports allowing property owners to use their land as they choose, provided the use is reasonable and consistent with applicable regulations. He acknowledged; however, that there are circumstances in which limitations are necessary to protect the greater interests of the community.

Commissioner Allen, who lives west of the property, stated that the site has always been clean, organized, and well maintained. She described Mr. Maughan as a respectful neighbor and noted that his equipment is no more disruptive than the agricultural equipment commonly used in the area. She expressed support for the proposal, noting that the property would be put to productive use.

Commissioner Meacham agreed that the City should accommodate business growth when appropriate. He stated that the potential nuisances associated with the proposed use appear to have been adequately mitigated and that the application meets all required approval criteria.

Commissioner Smith stated that it is logical and appropriate for the entire property to have consistent zoning.

Commissioner Christensen said the proposed zone change aligns with the City's Master Plan.

*****Commissioner Christensen moved to recommend approval to the City Council for Ordinance 2026-12, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Number 09-057-0002 from RLD (Residential Low Density) and HC (Highway Commercial) to HC (Highway Commercial). The parcel is located at approximately 250 West 100 South and is approximately 1.9 acres. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. The motion was approved 5-0.*****

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

No Vote: None

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing 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" and 12-805-6 "Area of Accessory Buildings".

Mr. Lewis said currently only internal ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Unit) are allowed, which has been state-mandated. This proposal would allow detached ADUs.

6:53 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Terrie Wierenga questioned Section B.7 *“7. Any new construction, remodeling or renovation of an existing structure or addition of a new detached structure shall conform to the setbacks, health, fire, building and other code requirements current at the time of the application. No building shall be erected to a height greater than thirty-five (35) feet.”* She stated that the proposed language appeared vague in light of the previous discussion, asked which setbacks the wording was intended to reference, and recommended that the condition be revised to clearly identify the specific setback requirements rather than relying on general language. There is currently a section of code that mandates that “no more than 25% of the rear yard is supposed to be covered by a structure.” She is very supportive of accessible and affordable housing, but she encouraged the Commission to think about growth control. She would like to see open spaces maintained. Another concern she voiced is regarding Fire Department access. This was a concern when she served on the City Council years ago, and it is why flag lots were not allowed.

Bryan Kendrick owns a couple of contracting companies and said this is something that is needed. He encouraged some leniency on the setbacks so that they will not be too limiting. This will provide opportunities for citizens, especially with rising housing costs. It seems like a great win for Richmond, and he likes that this is being considered.

6:59 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion on possible vote on Ordinance 2026-10.

Commissioner Christensen has spoken with some residents, and the topic of setbacks came up. The current setbacks of 15 feet and 30 feet might be too restrictive for some property owners. A rule limits each property to one attached ADU. If lenient setbacks are approved, it would be helpful to discuss options to address privacy concerns. He noted that other states generally allow a 5-foot setback for the ADU.

Chairman Wallis said Ms. Wierenga’s point is valid; if it is not specific enough to be understood, it will be difficult for residents and staff to interpret.

In response to Ms. Wierenga’s question about fire access, Mr. Lewis noted that B.10 states, “10. A detached dwelling unit must be approved by the fire department and meet their requirements for emergency access.”

Commissioner Christensen said the distance from the primary dwelling was not discussed and should be considered. Chairman Wallis said the setbacks for detached units seem more critical than the distance from the primary dwelling.

The Commission revisited its prior discussion on the placement of detached accessory dwelling units, reaffirming that a detached unit may be located in front of the primary dwelling, provided it meets all applicable development standards and conditions discussed at the previous meeting.

Commissioner Meacham pointed out that the property owner is required to live in one of the dwellings, which will ideally help mitigate possible nuisances.

Commissioner Christensen highlighted the purpose statement: “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.” He noted that the intent is not to encourage large-scale housing development but to provide modest housing opportunities that help address current housing needs while preserving the community’s quality and character.

The Commission reviewed the current setbacks. Mr. Lewis recommended that if the setbacks are adjusted, an ADU line item be included in each setback section of each allowed zone for agricultural and residential which includes Sections 12-903-5, 12-904-5, and 12-906-5.

Commissioner Meacham asked whether privacy mitigation, such as window placement, needs to be addressed for taller structures. Chairman Wallis said this will be difficult to monitor and enforce. Mr. Lewis agreed that the City should not be too involved in privacy issues as the property owner should handle them during the design process.

Chairman Wallis said that using existing setbacks limits the potential. It would then be up to a property owner to decide whether to add an internal ADU or to follow all applicable regulations for a detached ADU including applicable setbacks.

Mr. Lewis questioned the purpose of establishing setback requirements if the City is willing to allow them to be reduced under this circumstance. Chairman Wallis agreed, noting that reducing them in certain situations could create unforeseen problems.

Commissioner Christensen noted that larger lots are typically located in less dense areas; reducing the required setback for an ADU on smaller lots might create a balance. Chairman Wallis said attached/internal units on smaller lots make more sense.

Commissioner Smith suggested adding a reference to the applicable setback sections of the code into the proposed Ordinance.

Mr. Lewis reminded the Commission that the code can be amended at any time. This could provide a starting point that can be adjusted as necessary over time.

*****Commissioner Smith moved to recommend approval to the City Council for 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”, Parts, 12-805-21 “Accessory Dwelling Unit” and 12-805-6 “Area of Accessory Buildings”, amending Part 12-805-21 (B) (7) to reference current setbacks as contained in Municipal Code Sections 12-903-5, 12-904-5 and 12-906-5. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-1.*****

Yes Vote: Allen, Meacham, Smith, Wallis

No Vote: Christensen

Initial discussion on Ordinance 2026-11, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)”, Chapter 12-300 “Definitions” and Title 13-000 “Police Department”, Chapter 13-200 “Animal Control”, Part 13-221 “Allowable Animals” and adding Part 12-233 “Chickens”.

Chairman Wallis said this is being discussed because the current code language is very hard to understand and interpret.

Mr. Lewis explained that this was an initial discussion of the draft ordinance and that no public hearing or vote would occur at this meeting. He stated that regulations for dogs, cats, and chickens would be addressed separately. The proposed Ordinance would apply only to residential zoning districts and would not affect agricultural zones. He noted that although the draft does not address every issue, it is intended to provide a foundation for discussion and future refinement. He also clarified that roosters would not be permitted under Section 13-233 as currently written.

The proposed ordinance changes include:

Strike out Item F. in 12-300 DEFINITIONS Section

(additional wording in **bold**)

13-221 ALLOWABLE ANIMALS AND NUMBER OF ANIMALS PERMITTED.

Domesticated dogs, domesticated cats, ~~and those animals contained under the definition of “animal unit” in the current Planning and Zoning Ordinance, to include~~ horses, cows, steers, sheep, goats, rabbits, chickens, pheasants, turkeys, ducks, geese, and pigeons, will be allowable within the municipal limits of Richmond City.

The total number of said animals, less dogs and cats, will be in keeping with the provisions of the aforesaid ordinance. Animals not listed ~~in the current animal unit definition~~ will be handled on a case-by-case basis presented by the owner to the ~~Richmond City Council, City Administrator, and Mayor for consideration. The keeping of pigs is prohibited.~~

For information on dogs, see RMC Parts 13-240 “Dogs” and 13-260 “Kennels”.

**Animals may only be kept within a single-family residential zone, when permitted by this title and in accordance with the provisions of these regulations.
Agriculturally zoned parcels do not apply to this Part.**

A. Number Allowed: The number of allowable animals kept shall be determined based on the Animal Equivalent Unit (AEU) for each animal and the size of the

parcel set aside for the animals.

- B. Classification:** Each animal species shall be assigned one of the following classifications based on their size, and their anticipated social and environmental impact:

1. Large size animal - cow, horse, donkey, mule, llama
2. Medium size animal - sheep, goat
3. Large fowl - turkey, goose
4. Small animals, fowl - pheasant, duck, pigeon, rabbit.

Animals not listed above and which are not considered household pets or animals which are not otherwise restricted, may be kept in accordance with this section in numbers consistent with their approximate size. Chickens are not included in this Part. For information on Chickens see RMC Part 12-33 “Chickens”.

- C. Animal Equivalent Unit:** Each classification of animal shall be represented by an Animal Equivalent Unit as follows:

Animal Classification	Adult Animal Equivalent Per Animal	Unit Animal Density Per AEU
Large Animal	1.00	1.00
Medium Animal	0.50	2.00
Large Fowl	0.10	10.00
Small Animal and Fowl	0.05	20.00

- D. Animal Density:** The number of animals assigned to a parcel shall not exceed a density of two (2) animal equivalent units (AEU) for parcels 10,000 square feet (0.23 acres) to 43,560 square feet (1.00 acre). For parcel size in excess of one acre, the number of AEU's allowed doubles for each additional acre. For example, parcel sizes of 1.01 – 2.00 acres would allow four (4) AEU's. Animal species can be mixed provided the allowable density is not exceeded.

- E. Young Animal Allowance:** Animals which are less than one year old in the large animal and the medium animal categories as listed in the table above will only count at half the adult Animal Equivalent Unit rate.

- F. Pigs:** Fair Pigs are allowed in certain zones as listed in RMC Chapter 12-3000 “Permitted Use Matrix”. Pigs raised for any other purpose are not allowed in any zone.

13-233 CHICKENS

- A.** Subject to the requirements of this Part and any other applicable provision of this code, hen chickens regardless of age, in the amount set forth below, may be kept on a lot or parcel of land in a residential zone, except for the multiple-family residential zone, for the sole purpose of producing eggs. Roosters are not allowed.

1. The number of hens which may be kept shall be limited based on the size

of the lot or parcel as follows:

(a) 10,000 square feet and under – up to four (chickens)

(b) For each additional 1,000 square feet in parcel size, one (1) additional chicken will be allowed.

B. Chickens shall be confined within a secure outdoor enclosed area which shall include a covered, ventilated, and predator-resistant chicken coop.

- 1. The coop shall have a minimum floor area of at least two (2) square feet per chicken.**
- 2. If chickens are not allowed to roam within an enclosed area outside the coop, the coop shall have a minimum floor area of six (6) square feet per chicken.**
- 3. The coop, unless movable, shall be located in a rear yard at least twenty-five feet (25') from any dwelling located on an adjacent lot and that there be a three foot (3') setback between the property line and the coop.**
- 4. The coop and enclosed area shall be maintained in a neat and sanitary condition.**
- 5. No chicken shall be permitted to roam outside the enclosed area or outside the coop if there is no enclosed area.**
- 6. Chicken feed shall be stored and dispensed in rodent-proof and predator-proof containers.**
- 7. It shall be unlawful for any person to keep any chicken in a residential zone in a manner contrary to the provisions of this section.**

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Lewis said the typos would be fixed.

Commissioner Christensen likes that this is easier to understand and that the animal units are based on the size of the parcel/lot.

Commissioner Allen asked whether venomous snakes should be prohibited under the proposed Ordinance. Commissioner Christensen said that such a prohibition could be difficult to enforce. He noted that a similar argument could be made about potentially dangerous dogs and stated that responsible pet owners should not be penalized for the actions of irresponsible owners.

Scott Pratt said an animal equivalent unit (AEU) is a scientific term or ratio that measures species sizes, or classes of animals. He encouraged the Commission to consider temporary animals such as goats that come in to maintain a pasture, 4-H or FFA animals for a season.

Terrie Wierenga said AEU information can be found on the USDA website. She also asked for consideration of families who raise animals to butcher for their families and how this should be incorporated.

Chairman Wallis asked members to do more research. He wants this Ordinance to be easily understood by residents.

Mr. Lewis will add this item to next month's agenda for continued discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting: September 1, 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, August 4, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 P.M.

1. Approval of the planning commission meeting minutes from July 7, 2026
2. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-12, an Ordinance rezoning Cache County Parcel Number 09-057-0002 from RLD (Residential Low Density) and HC (Highway Commercial) to HC (Highway Commercial). The parcel is located at approximately 250 West 100 South and is approximately 1.9 acres.
3. Discussion on possible vote on Ordinance 2026-12.
4. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing 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" and 12-805-6 "Area of Accessory Buildings".
5. Discussion on possible vote on Ordinance 2026-10.
6. Initial discussion on Ordinance 2026-11, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)", Chapter 12-300 "Definitions" and Title 13-000 "Police Department", Chapter 13-200 "Animal Control", Part 13-221 "Allowable Animals" and adding Part 12-233 "Chickens".

Adjourn

*****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.