



Harrisville City Planning Commission Minutes

Harrisville City Offices
363 W Independence Blvd – Harrisville
Wednesday, February 11, 2026 – 7:00 pm

Commissioners: Chad Holbrook, Vice Chair **Staff:** Jennie Knight, City Administrator
Isaac Thomas Sarah Wichern, City Planner
Christina Palmer Cynthia Benson, Deputy Recorder
Ruben Morales

Excused: Angie Francom, Chair, Bryan Fife, Public Works Director.

Visitors: Airon Jones, Justin Jones.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Holbrook called the meeting to order and excused Chair Francom. He welcomed Ruben Morales to the Planning Commission and all those in attendance.

2. OATH OF OFFICE

Oath of offices were administered to Chad Holbrook and Ruben Morales.

3. CONSENT APPROVAL – of Planning Commission meeting minutes from January 14, 2026.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas motioned to approve meeting minutes from January 14, 2026. Commissioner Palmer seconded the motion.

Chad Holbrook Yes
Isaac Thomas Yes
Christina Palmer Yes
Ruben Morales Yes

The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

4. DISCUSSION/ACTION/RECOMMEND – to grant recommended Conditional Use Permit #150 for a home occupation located at approximately 1967 N 275 W.

Sarah Wichern, City Planner, reminded the commissioners that the goal with a conditional use permit for a home occupation is to verify the home occupation does not change the residential neighborhood operations.

Airon Jones, applicant, explained she received her cosmetology license in Salt Lake. With her current work schedule, she has decided to get back into doing cosmetology. She plans to complete lash treatments, facials, body care, and body waxing in her home which fall under her current licensing. She will start with one client at a time. She plans on using one room in her home with access to a restroom which is state board regulated. There is one parking stall for clientele which

is already assigned to her address.

Commissioner Holbrook asked what hours she tends to have clientele. Ms. Jones replied she was not quite sure yet, but she is thinking from 10pm to 5pm. Commissioner Holbrook continued by asking if this will turn into her primary job or will she still be working at her current employ. Ms. Jones replied she would still work at her current employ. This would be part-time. She desires to start out by offering services in the afternoons, Friday and Saturday, ending by 5-6pm. Her goal is to work 3 to 4 days a week.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if there would be any selling of products. Ms. Jones said she has her wholesale license with the state. Jennie Knight, City Administrator, the city does not generally prohibit the sale of a product to a client given service. However, the city would prohibit the sale of products as a retail distribution center. Ms. Jones clarified she would sell to her client's basic skin care items such as facial treatments, moisturizers, conditioners, etc.

Ms. Jones stated she did receive HOA approval for her home occupation. She asked if the sign she had planned on displaying was approved by the city. She displayed a small 12" by 18" yard sign with her business logo on it. Ms. Wichern responded by saying the signage would be whatever the HOA requires. She read HCMC §11.23.070(i) Zone Regulations – Name Plates. *One (1) name plate for each dwelling unit, not exceeding two (2) square feet in area, indicating the name of the occupant, and/or a permitted home occupation.* The signage displayed falls under this requirement and is approved.

Ms. Wichern continued her memo reviewing expectations of a home occupation. She found no reason this home occupation would interference with neighbors. The hours of operation could be from 7am to 10pm with no exterior lighting. The room can be no more than 300 sq feet for the use. If in the future Ms. Jones proposes permanent makeup she would need to be in compliance with Weber Morgan Health requirements. She is required to obtain a business license from Harrisville and any state agency licensing. Recommendations are to comply with outlined regulations in the memo, one client at a time, and use of designated parking space.

Commissioner Morales asked if the home occupation requires any inspections. Ms. Knight explained the home occupation will require inspections from the fire department and police department as part of the business license application.

MOTION: Commissioner Palmer motioned to grant recommended Conditional Use Permit #150 for a home occupation located at approximately 1967 N 275 W subject to Staff Report dated February 5, 2026, Harrisville City Municipal Code, and any other staff or agency requirements. Commissioner Morales seconded the motion.

Chad Holbrook	Yes
Isaac Thomas	Yes
Christina Palmer	Yes
Ruben Morales	Yes

The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

Commissioner Holbrook informed Ms. Jones there is an appeal process which will last 15 days.

Staff will contact the applicant after the appeal process is complete.

5. DISCUSSION – General Plan Amendments.

Ms. Wichern explained her desire to have a discussion with the commissioners about accessory dwelling units in order to define an ordinance which works for Harrisville. Her recommendations are from the Land Use Institute. She began the discussion by reviewing the definitions of the different types of accessory dwelling units.

Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) – A self-contained residential dwelling unit that is secondary to a primary dwelling on the same lot. An ADU includes independent living facilities for one household, including a kitchen, bathroom, and sleeping area. They must have a kitchen and be a livable space.

Accessory Dwelling Unit – Internal – An ADU located entirely within the existing footprint of the primary dwelling (e.g., basement, attic, or interior conversion) and not involving an expansion of the building footprint.

Accessory Dwelling Unit – Attached – An ADU that is physically attached to the primary dwelling but located partially or entirely outside the original footprint of the primary dwelling (e.g., an addition or attached garage conversion).

Accessory Dwelling Unit – Detached – An ADU located in a separate, freestanding structure on the same lot as the primary dwelling and not physically attached to it.

The first item she wanted to discuss was the number of ADUs permitted per lot. Most cities allow just one. The Land Use Institute suggested permitting more. Considerations if we wanted to allow more than one (1) ADU would be lot size, parking, setbacks, and lot coverage. She would not recommend two (2) ADU's on anything smaller than a half-acre, preferably a full acre.

Commissioner Morales asked if the ADU's would be kept within a family unit. Ms. Wichern said the ADU's could be rented to anyone. However, one of the buildings on the property must be owner-occupied. The idea behind this is the unit will be well maintained, well managed, and looked after because the owner is on the property. Also, creating a rental unit with a primary unit will help with affordability.

The next topic for discussion was location and setbacks. Currently the city code we allow for accessory structures. As long as they meet this code, then the dwelling would not be infringing upon the neighboring property any more than what was already allowed. She reviewed HCMC §11.09.030 – Accessory Building Development standards including position of the dwelling, setbacks, and privacy. Her recommendation is to include language stating a privacy wall would need to be placed along the property line.

Commissioner Morales asked how utility easements work in reference to building so close to the property line. Ms. Knight answered it is the property owner's responsibility to contact all utility entities possibly using the easement. They would need to obtain documentation stating the easement is not utilized by each utility entity in order for the city to consider vacating the easement for building purposes. The reason for the easement is because utilities used to be placed above

ground between lots. Now they are typically underground in front of the lot. The city does not see a lot of these old easements utilized by the utility entities. Ms. Wichern added she anticipates the ADU code would follow this same practice. If the owner wishes to build within an easement, then they would need to go through the process of obtaining the ability to do so.

Ms. Wichern said in the current ADU code side yard setback may be one (1) foot from a property line, except buildings with metal roofs shall be three (3) feet from any lot line. Ms. Knight said something to consider within code, if one property owner has an ADU on the property that is one (1) foot off property line, then the adjacent property owner cannot build next to it with the same setback. Due to this, the commissioners may want to consider placing something in the code for the ADU's not to be side by side. Ms. Wichern said fire code is six (6) feet. Maybe adding a three (3) feet setback in order to maintain this requirement would be appropriate.

Ms. Wichern moved to the next discussion topic of lot size and maximum ADU size. She gave examples of how with a larger lot, a larger ADU could be built. Commissioner Holbrook asked for her definition of larger. Ms. Wichern clarified that the ADU is larger than the main dwelling. However, in some circumstances, a newly built dwelling could become the primary dwelling for the lot and the existing dwelling become the ADU. Ms. Knight said there are certainly existing internal dwelling units being utilized this way. As long as the owner-occupied requirements are met, she does not see a reason this cannot occur.

Ms. Knight said in our current code, HCMC §11.20.260 – Internal ADU, lot size states an internal accessory dwelling is not allowed on anything smaller than 6,000 sq feet. If the ADU lot size is anything but 6,000 sq feet, then the Internal ADU code would need to be changed as well. After some discussion with parking considerations and examples of various possibilities with ADU's on a lot, the commissioners decided the minimum lot size would be 6,000 sq ft.

Ms. Wichern added her recommendation to limit coverage on parcels in order to maintain a balance. Her thought is all ADU's would not exceed ten percent (10%) of the lot area or the gross floor area of the primary dwelling whichever is less while maintaining a subordinate look. Discussion occurred on whether to utilize current code standards for detached ADU lot coverage which is twenty-five percent (25%) or to utilize the recommended ten percent (10%). Ms. Wichern gave an example of the recommended ten percent (10%). On a third acre lot of 15,000 sq ft you could only have a 1,500 sq feet ADU which is equivalent to a three-bedroom apartment.

Ms. Wichern moved onto building restrictions. The current height restriction for the ADU is 25-foot and a primary dwelling is 35-feet. These can be found in HCMC §11.09.020 – Main Building Development Standards. The ADU cannot exceed the height of the main dwelling. She asked if the commission would want a percentage instead. For example, a two-story building is roughly 25 ft. The restriction would be to a single story with attic access or approximately ninety percent (90%). She continued with other examples of esthetics for roof lines along with other possible restrictions such as removing 2-story dwellings altogether. They also discussed examples of appearances within the neighborhood including no dormers, windows, or doors along a neighboring property line.

Ms. Wichern's next topic for discussion was parking requirements. She stated internal ADU's are regulated by State meaning we cannot require more than one (1) parking space. This regulation is a concern based on experience. She recommends one (1) off-street parking space for units 600 sq

ft or less and two (2) off-street parking spaces for ADU's greater than 600 sq ft. This would take into consideration winter parking restrictions as well. After some discussion with the commissioners, it was agreed upon to have a requirement for at least one (1) off-street parking space for anything less than 600 feet. If it is larger than 600 sq ft, then two (2) off-street parking spaces. Ms. Wichern also recommended adding verbiage stating parking should not block or interfere with parking for primary dwellings and cannot count driveway spaces as parking spaces. Already in the code are replacing parking taken by building of ADU and materials for parking surfaces.

Commissioner Thomas said he has the ability to set up his property to have an internal ADU which would be over 600 sq ft. He would not have enough property to provide two (2) spaces. He is concerned that the two (2) space requirement might be a discouragement to others desiring setting up an ADU. Ms. Wichern clarified that for an internal ADU, according to the State, the city can only require one (1) parking space.

Commissioner Holbrook said he is currently building a two-story addition onto his home with the intent of having an 850 sq ft internal ADU on the bottom level. He has parking spaces for two (2) but feels anything more would interfere with his ability to park. He further explained he used the same setbacks as the main dwelling. He feels we need to be careful to have standards where the city can still retain its beauty. We do not want Harrisville to look like a villa where you have houses everywhere.

Commissioner Morales asked if there were any restrictions for the architecture design standards. Ms. Wichern replied she recommends the ADU should be subordinate in scale and massing and shall complement the architectural style of the primary dwelling. Prebuilt ADU's would be advantageous for cost reasons. Ms. Knight added we need to be careful the ADU is not a mobile home since the city already has a code for them. The ADU would need to have permanent utility connections. Ms. Wichern further clarified premanufacturing would be a consideration for affordability as long as it has permanent utility connections. She gave an example of how a tiny home in the backyard could work and how it would not distract from the backyard because it would appear as a shed.

Ms. Knight added the State does not like it when cities add specific limitations to architectural standards. They prefer guidelines. Something to keep in mind is the age of the home. To match that style would be tricky. She gave an example of construction materials changing after COVID and how it caused mixed feelings about using newer materials. The commissioners liked the wording of *complimentary architecture to the primary dwelling* for this section. Ms. Wichern added the ADU will need to meet all single-family home requirements with the exception of only one kitchen, primary entrance has to be on the side or rear, and the entrance has to be visible from the street. She gave examples of where the entrance would be and how it may appear. Ms. Knight gave an example of casitas in St. George as a possible consideration for potential guideline ideas.

The commissioners reviewed the kitchen requirement in the ADU. Hotplates would not be considered a true kitchen nor would a kitchenette. The definition states it would need to be a kitchen.

Ms. Wichern reviewed her last considerations, which included dwelling unit esthetics, fire code requirements, separate utility meters, addressing on the building and at the post office, setbacks,

impact fees for utilities, potential building permit considerations, and clear identification for first responders.

Ms. Knight said separate meters on ADU's would be determined by the utility providers. Utility meters on internal ADU's would be the same as the primary dwelling. She gave an example of how Farmington allowed ADU'S for a number of years. Because of the housing market, the city allowed the properties to be sold and subdivided. We need to take this into consideration what the utility preference would be and would this ADU warrant more use of utilities. If so, would impact fees be assessed on the building permit or at some other time in the process?

Ms. Wichern added Farmington noticed their infrastructure was overbuilt due to the demographics of their community. They were not worried about the sale of the ADU's. Harrisville is not this way. We should consider the future of infrastructure as well since the impact analysis and capital facilities plan does not take this into consideration.

Ms. Knight stated the city is working through this issue with our mixed-use. The city's general plan intended to have commercial development in the pink zones which would have been a few connections to infrastructure. Now the city is beginning to see a mixture of residential and commercial, which has made a significant impact on the city's infrastructure. If an impact fee is charged, then that money goes directly to upsizing a sewer pipeline.

Ms. Wichern reiterated requiring a second meter on an internal or attached ADU would be complicated. However, on a detached it would be beneficial. The city would need to check with the utility entities to see what their requirements are. She added, if we do not collect impact fees then the current residents would be subsidizing for these additional structures.

Ms. Wichern asked about addressing the ADU such as adding a letter or number to the address. Ms. Knight said the post office is now requiring postal box units for new subdivisions. This is something we want to consider in regard to postal services.

Ms. Wichern continued by saying we may want to consider verbiage for emergency response signage. She then circled back to her first recommendation and asked the commissioners if they would want more than one ADU per lot. They all agreed to limit the number to one (1) per lot. The main concern is for infrastructure.

Commissioner Thomas asked for clarification on whether or not one (1) ADU and one (1) internal ADU could be possible. Ms. Wichern gave an example of how to use the HOAZ ordinance in this situation.

Ms. Knight added the way we process the current internal ADU ordinance is through the litmus test meaning whether or not they are using the ADU as an income. Most situations we find out about the internal ADU is when the owner desires to obtain a rental business license. It is difficult for the city to regulate. Most ADU's are being used for family or aging parents. We need to be mindful what the city is offering for housing options.

Commissioner Holbrook asked what the process would be for someone if they desire to have an ADU. Ms. Wichern said she would be placing the application process within the ordinance.

After further discussion with potential legislation, outreach to the community, and the incentive of a good landlord program, the commission and staff discussed the next steps for this ordinance. Ms. Knight said this is a land use amendment and would require a public hearing. It was decided that Ms. Wichern would create a draft ordinance to be reviewed in a work session next month, April there would be the public hearing for the ordinance, and then another work session in May after taking public comment before recommending to the City Council. Ms. Knight added, if staff are ready, part of the work session could be a recommendation of the housing strategies to the city council.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS – (3 minute maximum)

No public comment was presented.

7. COMMISSION/STAFF FOLLOW-UP

Ms. Knight said the only follow-up she had is the annual training for the commissioners. The commissioners did receive some credit for the January training on Open Meetings and Non-Discrimination. However, the city needs a total of four (4) hours per commissioner. You can obtain these hours by attending online training from the Land Institute (LAUA), reading from the Land Use book, or attending a formal training such as the ULCT spring conference in St. George or the ULCT fall conference in Salt Lake. When you obtain your hours, email them to herself or Ms. Wichern. Ms. Wichern added the American Planning Association (APA) is another resource.

Ms. Knight updated the commission on the new Public Safety / City Hall. We are running a little behind on the road due to the requirements of the funding, but the building is moving along. The footings are already in. She is not aware of when North View Fire will add their building. Their building will sit to the east of the Public Safety / City Hall.

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Holbrook motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion. The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

Chad Holbrook
Vice-Chair

Cynthia Benson
Deputy City Recorder