



**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, March 3, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 PM.

Call to Order

1. Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from February 3, 2026.
2. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-01, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 13-000 "Police Department", Chapter 13-200 "Animal Control", Parts 13-261 "Definition and Establishment" and 13-265 "Pre-Existing Kennels".
3. Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-01.

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 accommodation for this meeting should contact the City Office at (435) 258-2092, at least 3 days before the date of the meeting.



# 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, February 3, 2026

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

**Commission Members Excused:** John Hortin, Brent Wallis

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

**Others Present:** Terrie Wierenga, Debbie Zilles

Councilmember Draxler introduced Councilmember Bryce Wood, who will be serving as the City Council liaison to the Planning Commission this year. Councilmember Draxler appreciates the time and effort members devote to the condition.

Approval of the September 2, 2025 meeting minutes

**\*\*\*Cindy moved to approve the September 2, 2025 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Cache seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0.\*\*\***

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

**No Vote: None**

**Absent: Wallis**

Discussion on Municipal Code Part 12-805-21 “Accessory Dwelling Unit”

Justin explained that interior accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are quite popular and are required to be allowed under State Code, whereas detached ADUs are not. He noted that there have been some requests for detached units, which are currently not permitted in Richmond. The Commission was asked whether this is an issue they wish to address at this time. If so, additional discussion would be needed regarding matters such as utilities, height restrictions, setbacks, and parking. He also noted that several nearby cities allow detached ADUs, with each city having tailored its code to fit its specific needs.

Cache stated that Richmond’s ADU code includes a provision requiring the property owner to reside in the primary dwelling, which helps maintain the integrity of the property. He noted that there will always be a demand for rental housing, and that allowing detached units could help meet affordable housing needs without placing a significant burden on the City. He added that incremental growth, rather than large developments, may be a preferable approach. Cache also noted that the current ADU ordinance was updated on June 17, 2025 via Ordinance 2025-06. During those discussions, detached units were

considered; however, concerns were raised that a rezone and/or boundary line adjustment could be completed through the County without the City's knowledge until after the fact, which could complicate utility services.

Justin agreed and provided an example from another city in the valley where a building was constructed behind an existing home and later subdivided through the County, resulting in two separate property owners. He explained that both properties share utilities and that the lots are illegal and should not have been sold as separate properties. Justin also noted that another issue that would need to be addressed is familial relationships under the current code—for example, renting a basement as an ADU to one family member while renting a detached structure in the backyard to another. He stated that the Commission should consider these types of scenarios and determine how they would be handled and enforced.

Justin pointed out that North Logan has had success with units above garages, however, this may impact height allowances.

Brock said this is a sticky situation and each situation depends on the intended use. He would like to see the issue addressed.

Cindy is concerned about the integrity of the neighborhood. Owners have lived in their homes for years that have been zoned a certain way and like the rural area for a reason. She would not like one by her home, but she does understand the desire for them, especially under current economic challenges. Parking is another concern.

Cache suggested keeping the size of the ADU no larger than 80% of the main structure. He does not think the main reason for wanting one would be to maximize the profits from a property, but to allow a family or student to live with them; especially retired couples.

Todd asked if there have been many requests for detached. HollyJo said there are some, mostly familial-type questions such as young married kids cannot afford housing, they would like to turn their garage into a detached unit. The ones being approved now are in new subdivisions where all applicable requirements are being met. The Johnson View subdivision has three approved internal units.

Cache reiterated that there is a need for rental places and he would rather have an ADU than a large property management buying and renting out structures. One consideration will be to discuss how utilities will work such as share with primary owner, attach a second meter or create a separate line of service. There would be pros/cons to all those options.

Justin said current internal ADUs are not charged as a duplex. If the requirement remains that the property owner lives onsite, it is generally considered one unit.

Joel recommended contacting Nibley City who has a few large subdivisions going in with detached ADUs being built.

Cindy thinks internal ADUs are fine for now and would like to wait on considering detached units.

Brock, Cache and Todd think the Commission needs to spend some time discussing it because there are people asking about it.

Justin said staff can draft a basic outline and bring it back next month for more discussion. He asked members to do some research with other cities and send in suggestions, recommendations and/or concerns. HollyJo also said there needs to be consideration for those that may need to be grandfathered in due to items such as the 10-foot fire wall separation.

Discussion on Municipal Code Parts 13-260 “Kennels”, 13-261 “Definition And Establishment”, 13-262 “Fees”, 13-263 “Temporary Residence”, 13-264 “Care And Operation Requirements”, 13-265 “Pre-Existing Kennels” and 13-266 “Licensing of Kennel Animals”.

Justin said the City has received a few calls asking if this is about barking issues. It is not; it is only addressing updating the current kennel ordinance which was last amended on December 14, 2021. A kennel license is required for 3 or more dogs. Staff needs to know how to handle these type of concerns. He did suggest removing last sentence in Part 13-261 Section A ~~“An agreement signed by all neighbors (immediately adjacent and directly across from the proposed kennel) must be submitted to the city with each application.”~~ because it is an antiquated process and may not be helpful in all situations especially where neighbors do not like one another and would never agree to anything. The Commission agreed.

Cache noted that cases are very unique and ambiguous. He has one neighbor who has multiple dogs but they are trained well and he never sees or hear them, but another neighbor could have one dog that barks continuously. He is happy that there are nuisance/noise ordinances to help.

The Commission agreed that a minimum of 14,500 square feet is required for a kennel of three dogs, and a minimum of 20,000 square feet is required for a license for four to six dogs.

Justin said enforcement needs to be considered. For example, there is a current resident who has three dogs that are kept in the home, they bark when anyone walks by and can be seen through the front door. The owner does not have, and refuses to get, a kennel license because he maintains that they are always in the home. Staff would like guidance on how to handle this type of situations.

Cache said education is a good component when they come in to apply.

The Commission agreed to remove 12-265 A ~~“For the purposes of this chapter, a de facto kennel shall be defined as any individual/family who has three or more dogs legally licensed at his/her/their residence as of January 31, 2003”.~~

Mr. Lewis said the application and ordinance will be amended and brought back next month for further discussion and review.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting: Tuesday, March 3, 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, February 3, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 P.M.

1. Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from September 2, 2025.
2. Discussion on Municipal Code Part 12-805-21 "Accessory Dwelling Unit".
3. Discussion on Municipal Code Parts 13-260 "Kennels", 13-261 "Definition And Establishment", 13-262 "Fees", 13-263 "Temporary Residence", 13-264 "Care and Operation Requirements", 13-265 "Pre-Existing Kennels" and 13-266 "Licensing of Kennel Animals".

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 date of the meeting.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION  
ORDINANCE 2026-01**

WHEREAS, the City Council of Richmond has the responsibility for the general welfare of the City; and

WHEREAS, such responsibility includes but is not limited to, establishment of best management practices;  
and

WHEREAS, management practices may evolve over the passage of time:

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of Richmond City, County of Cache, State of Utah, hereby adopts,  
passes and publishes the following:

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE RICHMOND CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 13-000  
“POLICE DEPARTMENT”, CHAPTER 13-200 “ANIMAL CONTROL”, PARTS 13-261  
“DEFINITION AND ESTABLISHMENT” AND 13-265 “PRE-EXISTING KENNELS”.**

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF RICHMOND CITY, CACHE COUNTY, UTAH AS  
FOLLOWS:

1. Sections shall be amended such that the highlighted areas below shall be added and the ~~strikeout~~ areas shall be deleted.

**13-261 DEFINITION AND ESTABLISHMENT**

Anyone, other than a licensed veterinary clinic, owning, keeping, harboring, or maintaining three (3) or up to six (6) dogs over the age of four (4) months at any given address shall be considered to be operating a dog kennel. Individuals, families, multiple occupants of a single dwelling, companies, corporations, or other combinations considering the establishment of a kennel must adhere to the provisions listed below.

- A. Obtain a conditional use permit. In considering each application for a conditional use permit relating to a dog kennel, the City Administrator or designee shall consider, among other things, the zone in which the conditional use is proposed, the size of the lot involved (refer to 13-261(B) below), the proximity of the proposed kennel to neighbors, the proposed size of the kennel, its placement on the property, and the proposed number of dogs, whether less than four (4) months old or four months (4) and older. Each permit shall clearly state the maximum number of dogs to be allowed, regardless of age. ~~An agreement signed by all neighbors (immediately adjacent and directly across from the proposed kennel) must be submitted to the city with each application.~~

**13-265 PRE-EXISTING KENNELS**

~~Existing de facto kennels at the time of the passage of this ordinance are protected from the 20,000 square feet of land requirement and need to obtain a conditional use permit but are subject to the license fee payment. De facto kennels must adhere to the provisions of 13-264 or their status will be immediately revoked. Should the de facto kennel cease to function for one (1) calendar year, or should ownership of the property change without immediate assumption of identical kennel use, said protection is lost.~~

~~For the purposes of this chapter, a de facto kennel shall be defined as any individual/family who has three or more dogs legally licensed at his/her/their residence as of January 31, 2003.~~

2. Should any section, clause, or provision of this Ordinance be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, in whole or in part, the same shall not affect the validity of the Ordinance as whole, or any other part thereof.
3. All ordinances, and the chapter, clauses, sections, or parts thereof in conflict with provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed, but only insofar as is specifically provided for herein.

Ordinance 2026-01

4. This ordinance shall become effective after the required public hearing and upon its posting as required by law.

THIS ORDINANCE shall be attached as an amendment to the Richmond City Municipal Code above referred to.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the Richmond City Council on this 17th day of March, 2026.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder