



**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, May 5, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 PM.

Call to Order

1. Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from April 7, 2026.
2. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-03, 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 and possible vote on Ordinance 2026-03.
4. Discussion on “Personal Care Services” in the “Permitted Use Matrix”.

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, April 7, 2026**.

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)

Others Present: Terri Wierenga, Mike Hite, Ryan Palmer, Debbie Zilles

Approval of the March 3, 2026 meeting minutes

*****Commissioner Meacham moved to approve the March 3, 2026, Planning Commission meeting minutes. Commissioner Smith 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 2026-02, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Manual of Design & Construction Standards, Chapter 6.0 "Irrigation Water Design", Section 6.01 "General".

Mr. Lewis explained that staff was directed by the Mayor and City Council to draft the proposed Ordinance amendment. The amendment would remove the requirement that irrigation systems be installed in all new subdivisions. He noted that the requirement has not functioned as originally intended since its adoption several years ago. Mr. Lewis stated that developers would still have the option to install irrigation system; however, it would no longer be mandatory. He explained that in some cases there may not be sufficient water shares available to support such systems, or implementation could result in unequal distribution among properties. He noted that these challenges have created practical difficulties, and mayor recommends removing the mandatory requirement.

Mr. Lewis explained that the current City Code requires secondary irrigation systems to be constructed in all subdivisions and dedicated to the City. He noted that this requirement was adopted approximately five years ago with the intent of reducing demand on the culinary water system; however, the City has since determined that the requirement is not functioning as intended.

Mr. Lewis provided examples to illustrate the issue. He stated that five subdivisions have been constructed since the requirement was adopted; while each includes the necessary infrastructure, none have been connected to an operational irrigation system. In another example, a 15-home subdivision has only six water shares available. If the system were activated, a determination would need to be made regarding which six homes would receive access, creating inequities among property owners. He also noted that delivering water to these systems presents additional challenges.

Mr. Lewis clarified that the proposed amendment would not prohibit developers from installing irrigation systems but would remove the mandatory requirement to do so. He added developers have the option to either pay a water dedication fee or transfer water shares to the City, with most opting to pay the fee. In one instance where shares were available, the system still could not be activated due to insufficient shares to support the full subdivision.

Mr. Lewis also noted that the Richmond Irrigation & Power Company (RIPC), which manages agricultural and secondary water systems in the area, operates independently and is not a City-run entity.

6:33 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

Terrie Wierenga was involved in working on this Ordinance when it was initially drafted. There were many discussions on shares versus fees. The typical home in Richmond City does not need a full share of irrigation water to take care of their yard. The thought when this was written was to have one meter going into the subdivision, controlled by the City, because the City would control the shares. All the homes would be assessed an annual fee proportionate to their water use. The goal was to significantly reduce the amount of treated water used for yards. She is disappointed to see this direction. She would have strongly encouraged the city council to work harder on solutions. There was quite a bit of grant money at the time because of the legislative decision mandating that any new residential hookup require a meter. In talks with the City Council, the City Engineer, and RIPC it seemed everyone was ready to work on it. She understands the subdivision in the northeast section of town, irrigation water has not been historically used, which would have been a challenge, but there were some possible solutions. She questioned what would happen with the shares the City owns if this is amended. She does not see a change application being possible on water shares; that would only be applicable to water rights.

Mike Hite lives Johnson View Estates, the new subdivision on 265 East 200 South. He has two properties, both plumbed for secondary water and he has two shares of water. He asked if would ever be possible to use his shares on his properties. He wants to use them but cannot because it is not connected to the subdivision. Chairman Wallace said this might be a question for RIPC. Mr. Hite said he has talked with them and was told it is the City's responsibility, so he is frustrated with the run around. Ms. Wierenga said there were a few similar issues that came up when she was the liaison with RIPC. The reason Mr. Hite was told that by that by RIPC is because he personally owns the

shares, not the City. Her understanding is once this is changed; it would negate the previous piping and installations the City had put in.

Mr. Lewis explained that the water dedication payment or share transfer is completely separate from this discussion and it is not being considered for change in this Ordinance. City staff is actively working on one of the five subdivisions that are not hooked up. The goal is to determine what works best and then move forward with the other four subdivisions in the same circumstance long term where possible. He thinks the City will still look at the other infrastructure/installations long-term and has not heard otherwise at this point.

Chairman Wallace did not see anything added or deleted from the Ordinance about any existing or historical ones; it is just a requirement moving forward.

Ms. Weirenga said that would mean Mr. Hite would have to install a separate system to his property to hook onto. Mr. Hite said he is frustrated because that is an expensive option and he does know the right way proceed. If this is amended he will have to look at different options or selling his shares. He is currently leasing them, but does not want to continue holding them if he cannot use them.

Chairman Wallace urged Mr. Hite to contact Mayor Young and explain his concern. Mayor Young is a problem-solver and might be able to help.

Mr. Hite asked if other members of subdivision who hold water rights could hook to the pipe that is 50 feet kiddy-corner from their properties and pay for it themselves if the City cannot do it. Mr. Lewis said staff and council are always willing to review all options to find a reasonable solution.

6:44 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Commissioner Christensen likes the intent of the Ordinance. Using secondary instead of culinary to water yards is much better for everyone. From what he is understanding, the code was drafted but the deployment and the enforcement of it was difficult. From a property owner or developer's point of view, if there are not enough shares for all the homes, the question becomes how to split them up and bill for water usage.

Mr. Lewis said developers do not like this code and would be happy to see changes; however, that was not the reason for the proposed amendments. The staff has identified right now that the missing link is the connection between the irrigation line and the subdivision. Once the connection is put in, there will need to be a decision made as to whether each connection will be metered. It is not currently mandated to meter irrigation, but long-term the legislature wants to move in that direction. This first subdivision will be a test to see how to move forward. Half shares cannot be allocated to a home; it would have to be a full share. The City would continue to hold the shares and pay the irrigation company assessment and then charge the homeowners per usage or in a way determined by the city council. The City cannot sell irrigation shares per state law. This will be learning curve when the first subdivision is brought online.

Ms. Allen asked how “the ball got dropped” from the original intent of the Code. Chairman Wallace said it is based on the difficulty of managing it. Mrs. Karren said they have had multiple discussions over the last three years looking for solutions. The problem will continue with each subdivision that comes in, or the changes are made and then there are only the five subdivisions that need a solution can be worked on, rather than those and any more that come in. This is a good time to make a change. Mr. Lewis said a dirty water/irrigation meter is much more expensive maintain and is typically replaced more often than a standard culinary water meter.

Commissioner Christensen asked if the amendment could or should include that it is not required for developments with smaller lots but perhaps required for larger 2-acre plus lots. Mr. Lewis said that would be very hard to dictate as the subdivision in question has a 14,500 square foot minimum lot size but several lots are over one-acre in size.

Commissioner Christensen said higher cost for higher usage could be implemented. Chairman Wallace suggested ways of incentivizing it. Commissioner Christensen said the problem with that is that the developer may commit to it, build the density they were approved for, and then leave it up to the City to provide a hookup.

Chairman Wallace said everyone agrees that having secondary water for yards is beneficial for the City. The problem is the City has limited staff and limited water resources.

Commissioner Meacham asked where the irrigation feeds from. Mr. Lewis said it comes from the main line on the east side of the city with 12 laterals starting in High Creek with the last lateral at the Utah State University farm. It is all gravity-fed.

Chairman Wallace said there is a pressurized system that allows water to be clean enough to flow through the meter, but some homes on pure canal water would require significant infrastructure improvement.

Commissioner Smith asked what happens when a developer pays the water fee. Mr. Lewis said it is kept in a restricted/dedicated fund, and the City can use it to purchase water rights or shares when they become available or expand the system.

Ms. Allen said this is something that needs to be carefully considered. She wondered if some percentage of xeriscaping could be required to avoid so much water waste. Mr. Lewis said the code is always subject to change at any time and if the commission wants to look at that type of option it could.

Commissioner Christensen asked if there is a way to require a secondary system be in place and connected before homes are allowed to be built. Mr. Lewis the City would have to work with RPIC to allow a connection in advance and typically state code stops these types of mandates in advance of a project being completed.

Commissioner Meacham said it is confusing knowing what entity is in charge of what. Mr. Lewis said the City would be responsible for the five systems in the five designated subdivisions. Mrs. Karren said that is why they are at a stall and the prices keep

increasing so the City would like to get something in place as soon as possible. Mr. Lewis said there is a connection fee associated with RPIC. The city must also bear the connection to the system and funds have not been allocated for these connections.

Commissioner Christensen liked Commissioner Allen's idea for better water use such as a certain portion must be xeriscape or have a graduating scale for the cost of water. Mr. Lewis said a tiered culinary water system is mandated by the state and Richmond has one in place. He said not having trees in the park strips and having them xeriscaped would be extremely helpful in terms of both water consumption and maintenance.

Ms. Allen would like to provide better xeriscaping education because there are many beautiful options, not just rocks and cactus but including water-wise plants.

Councilmember Wood said there are great types of grass that are water efficient as well.

Commissioner Christensen said this is half of the puzzle and will not solve the entire problem. There needs to be a bigger conversation on what else can be done to help improve the issue. Chairman Wallace agreed but noted that if it is not amended, it will only be adding to the problem.

Chairman Wallace reminded the Commission that the City Council has the ultimate decision, the Commission is just sending a recommendation to them for consideration. Nothing prohibits doing more work to find improved and better solutions. The concern is whether to keep the Ordinance as is, and have the problem backlog stack up, or change it and continue to tweak it.

Commissioner Meacham agrees that this issue needs further discussion. Chairman Wallace said members can submit ideas to the staff that can be added to future agendas for greater conversation.

Ms. Smith asked how many subdivisions are coming up. Mr. Lewis said there is one being proposed with approximately 44 homes and not enough shares, which is why this is a concern that needs to be addressed.

*****Commissioner Christensen moved to recommend approval to the City Council for Ordinance 2026-02, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Manual of Design & Construction Standards, Chapter 6.0 "Irrigation Water Design", Section 6.01 "General" with a recommendation that further investigation be done for ways to incentivize good water behavior. Commissioner Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-1.*****

Yes Vote: Christensen, Meacham, Smith, Wallis

No Vote: Allen

Discussion on Chapter 12-3000 “Permitted Use Matrix”

Mr. Lewis said this is a discussion about taxidermy, mortuary, and crematorium in the Permitted Use Matrix.

There is nothing under consideration, nor a proposal for, a taxidermy shop, but staff feels that it would be appropriate to add it into the matrix where applicable. The consensus is that it be allowed in the following zones: A-10, A-5, CBD, HC, MLI and allowing it as a conditional-use permit in RE-1 and RE-2. If the Commission agrees, staff will draft the ordinance and it will come back before it is approved. The Commission agreed with the recommendation.

Based on the NAICS definition of “Death Care Services” includes establishments that prepare the deceased for burial or cremation, manage funeral ceremonies and operate cemeteries or crematoriums. These services cover the preparation of human or animal remains, funeral home services and site management. Staff would like to add mortuary and crematorium for ease in searching. It is not changing how the matrix is laid out, just adding those two words to the title for ease of use.

Commissioner Christensen said mortuary and crematorium could be split up. He grew up in Preston and Webb Funeral Home was located on Oneida Street. The people lived in their home, with the mortuary connected to it and it was never an issue. He questioned whether something like this should be allowed in Richmond. Commissioner Smith said there may be a smell associated. Commissioner Christensen said mitigating conditions could be required to address things like smell. Chairman Wallace is worried that may be too subjective to enforce.

Ryan Palmer said the problem is not just the smell, but the knowledge of what is going on. It is happening in his neighbor’s yard and he does not think it is reasonable in a residential area.

Chairman Wallace said “Death Care Services” is currently an allowed use, if there are any changes or amendments proposed, there will be a future public hearing and vote.

The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Next scheduled meeting: May 5, 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, April 7, 2026**. The meeting will begin at 6:30 P.M.

1. Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from March 3, 2026.
2. Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2026-02, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Manual of Design & Construction Standards, Chapter 6.0 "Irrigation Water Design", Section 6.01 "General."
3. Discussion on possible vote on Ordinance 2026-02.
4. Discussion on Chapter 12-3000 "Permitted Use Matrix".

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.

**RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION
ORDINANCE 2026-03**

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 12-000
“LAND USE, DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT (LUDMO), CHAPTER 12-3000
“PERMITTED USE MATRIX”.**

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.

12-3000 PERMITTED USE MATRIX

Current: Death Care Services

Proposed: Death Care Services, Mortuary, Crematorium

Proposed new item: Taxidermy Studio/Shop

Permitted: A-10, A-5, CBD, HC, MLI
Conditional-Use Permit: RE-1, RE-2
Not Allowed: RLD, RMD, RMF, NC

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.
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 19th day of May, 2026.

RICHMOND CITY CORPORATION

Jeffrey D. Young, Mayor

ATTEST:

Justin B. Lewis, City Recorder

	A-10	A-5	RE-1	RE-2	RLD	RMD	RMF	NC	CBD	HC	MLI
OTHER SERVICES (EXCEPT PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION)											
Repair and Maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Automotive Repair and Maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Electronic and Precision Equipment Repair and Maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Commercial & Industrial Machinery & Equipment (except Automotive and Electronic) Repair and Maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Personal and Household Goods Repair and Maintenance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Personal and Laundry Services	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Personal Care Services	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes