



Harrisville City Planning Commission Minutes

Harrisville City Offices

363 W Independence Blvd – Harrisville

Wednesday, August 5, 2026 – 7:00 PM

Commissioners: Angie Francom, Chair
Chad Holbrook, Vice Chair
Isaac Thomas
Christina Palmer
Ruben Morales
Steven Hempel

Staff: Jennie Knight, City Administrator
Sarah Wichern, City Planner
Cynthia Benson, Deputy Recorder
Bryan Fife, Public Works Director

Visitors: Marv Farrell, Steven Hempel.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Francom called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

2. OATH OF OFFICE

Chair Francom welcomed Steven Hempel to the Planning Commission. Oath of Office was administered by Cynthia Benson, Deputy Recorder.

3. CONSENT APPROVAL – of Planning Commission meeting minutes from July 8, 2026.

MOTION: Commissioner Holbrook motion to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes of July 8, 2026. Commissioner Palmer second the motion. Motion passed with all in favor.

4. PUBLIC HEARING – to take comments for / against Ordinance 573: proposed text change to Land Use Sections HCMC§11.01.060, HCMC§11.08.020, and HCMC§11.10.020.

Sarah Wichern said the city received an application to expand uses for a produce stand in the A-1 zone. Currently, you are allowed to sell only what has been produced on your land. The reason the city is considering this is because Agricultural parcels within Harrisville City are generally small and can be difficult to maintain as economically viable agricultural operations. The proposed amendments are intended to provide property owners with additional opportunities to market and sell agricultural products while reducing the overhead costs associated with operating from a separate commercial location. Staff looked at how to achieve balance and expand without unattended consequences to neighboring properties.

The following are staff recommendations. However, the commission decides what the beneficial balance for the surrounding neighborhood would be. Staff felt the current definition for Commercial Crop and Fruit Production (HCMC §11.01.060) is not clear. They recommend changing the definition to "Produce Stand", which means a temporary or permanent structure, or an outdoor area, used for the display and sale of fruits, vegetables, and other agricultural products, including accessory consumable products as permitted by this title. A produce stand is accessory to agricultural production and is intended primarily for the sale of products grown or produced on the subject property or as otherwise permitted by this title. A produce stand shall not include a

grocery store, convenience store, restaurant, or other general retail establishments.

Commissioner Holbrook asked for examples of accessory consumable products. Sarah Wichern replied that these are items such as bread, canned goods, cookies, and other homemade goods. They would be subject to the health department regulations and agricultural regulations.

Sarah Wichern said in the HCMC §11.08.020 Uses Table the title would be the only item changing. Produce stands would be permitted in every zone.

Sarah Wichern said regulations would be found in HCMC §11.10.020 Special Regulations. Produce Stand is a permanent or temporary structure used for the selling of produce may be permitted. Section “A” says all produce sold on site shall be grown on the same parcel where the produce, vegetables or fruit is raised except in the A-1 zone. All other zones that are primary residential would adhere to the same regulations we have always had where if you are growing your own product, you can sell that at your stand, but we want to give some exceptions to the A-1 zone where they do have larger buffers available. Staff are proposing in the A-1 zone, at least one of the products, or produce, offered shall be grown, or produced, on the subject property and at least 50% of all produce and products offered for sale shall be grown or produced within Harrisville City. Produce stands in the A-1 zone may also sell accessory consumable products provided such products are produced within Harrisville City comply with all applicable health department regulations and constitute no more than 20% of the products offered for sale. Items such as tomatoes, potatoes, hay, corn, and bread. Products that could be consumable without seeing the entire offering of consumables. All products should comply with the regulations of the Department of Agriculture and Food.

Permanent structures need to meet the requirements for an accessory dwelling. The city code already has standards for this.

Section “C” refers to temporary structures in the A-1 or R-1-20 zones. The additions here would be no larger than 1,000 square feet for the A-1 zone or 1% of the lot area, whichever is least. One (1) acre would be 400 square feet. Two (2) acres would be 800 square feet. Once over 2 ½ acres, the size would be capped at 1,000 sq feet. In the R-1-20, it would be the same at 100 square feet. Staff did have the thought to increase this number to 150 square feet because most canopies sold are 12x12. The commissioners thought this was agreeable. Miss Wichern asked them to include this change as part of the motion.

Sarah Wichern said we do not have this in the specific code right now, but we want all Produce Stands to comply with the side yard setback requirements of the applicable zone. This way the owner of the stand would not be placing it right next to someone else’s property.

The next change was to change Harvest time to Harvest season in order to encompass the whole growing season. The commissioners and staff gave many examples of what this meant including pumpkins grown on the property and then made into pumpkin pies. This would also encompass other items that would be valuable for purchase beyond the harvest time.

Sarah Wichern reviewed setbacks. She said fifteen (15) feet from the edge of the road can be ambiguous. Section 5 states fifteen (15) feet from the edge of the road. Then with Section 6 we placed an extra provision to make sure there was no obstruction of sight distance for the property or neighboring properties. We have provisions like this in other city codes.

Section D will need to be updated to say temporary shade can be no larger than 150 square feet or 100 feet is permitted in the front yard setback in the RE-15 or RE-10 zones provided placed only during the harvest and season of the product being sold and complies with side yard setback requirements.

With these last sections, she realized there were no provisions for parking. Section E was added to the code to accommodate this regulation which reads *“One dedicated off-street parking space must be provided for each 100 square feet of permanent or temporary produce stand.”* These can be dirt. She is worried about SWPPP. She would like to know if the commission would like to include a hard surface or gravel to meet this requirement to prevent mud from being dragged onto the street. The commission discussed options to meet this requirement such as bark, traction pads, or gravel. Staff’s suggestion was to include in the motion the parking surface must have gravel or hard surface access. Chair Francom clarified that this area would need to be the transition space for the cars to drive over and knock off the dirt before entering city street.

Section E is the last requirement which are operation hours from 8am to 8pm. Commissioner Thomas asked if this was similar hours for the home occupation requirements. Sarah Wichern replied she reduced the hours because this will allow for more traffic than our home occupational uses. This has more of a retail nature to it. This is also why she added this use needs to be on an agricultural parcel and needs to have certain setbacks, so it does not compete with the residential nature. Agricultural pieces typically are on larger frontages which would allow for more traffic than a home occupation.

Commissioner Hempel said on C.6 we added the provision will not obstruct neighboring properties. He felt the revision in C.6 would be better added to Section D as D.1. The commission and staff discussed this and decided it would be a good consideration to add to the ordinance. Sarah Wichern suggested moving C.3 and C.6 to its own section and making it applicable to all zones. Commission agreed.

The commission further discussed the hours of operation. They liked the consideration from 8am to 8pm. Sarah Wichern said she is looking at this ordinance as a way to promote agricultural uses in Harrisville, apply regulations to prioritize products grown within Harrisville, require size and setbacks to protect neighborhood, and a clearer definition of the use.

Marv Farrell stated his first concern was the tracking of mud. He said just last week, he brought in a couple of loads of road base which is a UDOT approved road base. It is a one (1) inch minus which means when you drive on it, you will not sink and it will also compact better. There is dust on it which does track on the road. He is uncertain how to manage. If it rains or gets wet, it will track out. His thought is to bring in another load of gravel and place it on top of the road base at the entrance and exit to minimize anything that gets tracked out. He said he would do it anyway, but this could be a recommendation. However, he asked the commission to look at others as well and not just him. The commission and the applicant continued to discuss options to minimize the tracking of mud onto city roads such as his experience with this issue, traction pads, and the use of hay/straw during the wet seasons. They also discussed his parking area as it currently stands and what it could potentially be after the road expansion.

Marv Farrell’s feels 8am to 8pm is reasonable. He has already tried these hours. People will stop sometimes at 7am when he is there. What he has noticed is the morning people will stop. One or

two will stop at lunch. In the evening, on their way home, they stop for dinner or such. Sometimes he has people there in the late evening hours. The commission, staff, and applicant discussed other options for the time. In the end they all decided 7am to 9pm for the A-1 zone. All other zones would remain from 8am to 8pm.

Marv Farrell said he currently has a canopy on the corner of the property where the neighbor's driveway is. He has been keeping the visible line of sight for the neighbor. He has currently placed the canopy fifteen (15) feet back from the edge of the road. However, when the road expansion occurs the setback would put the canopy and the fence on the back of the sidewalk. After some discussion the current setbacks were reviewed to give clarity on what the setbacks should be. They decided to keep the fifteen (15) foot setback from the asphalt and ten (10) feet for the side setback for permanent or temporary structures.

They also reviewed approved signage and placement of them. Sarah Wichern said the city code already has codes to govern these regulations.

Chair Francom reviewed the rules of a public hearing before entertaining a motion to open the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas motion to open the public hearing. Commissioner Morales second the motion. Motion passed with all in favor.

There were no public comments.

MOTION: Commissioner Holbrook motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Morales second the motion. Motion passed with all in favor.

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION/RECOMMEND – recommendation of Ordinance 573:
proposed text change to Land Use Sections HCMC§11.01.060, HCMC§11.08.020, and HCMC§11.10.020.

Chair Francom reviewed her notes for the recommendation if the commission wishes to give a positive recommendation with changes such as canopy size and what zones it would be applicable, off-street parking, SWPPP requirements for egress, and hours of operation.

MOTION: Commissioner Hempel motioned to recommend adoption of Ordinance 573: proposed text change to Land Use Sections HCMC§11.01.060, HCMC§11.08.020, and HCMC§11.10.020 with the following changes; Item C2 changed to allow up to 150 square feet for R-1-20, R-1-15, and R-1-10; Items C3 and C6 apply to all zones; Section D, temporary shade canopy no more than 150 sq feet: Off street parking must have gravel, road base, or hard surface access to serve as a transition from dirt to road adequate to meet SWPPP requirements; operational hours in A-1 zones would be 7am to 9pm, all other zones would be 8am to 8pm subject to include any and all staff memos and other agency requirements and the Harrisville Municipal Code. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion.

Angie Francom	Yes
Chad Holbrook	Yes
Isaac Thomas	Yes

Christina Palmer	Yes
Ruben Morales	Yes
Steven Hempel	Yes

The motion passed with all voting in the affirmative.

6. DISCUSSION on residential zoning requirements for repealed R-3 and R5-6 Land Use Zones.

Sarah Wichern said at present we have areas in the city where the zoning requirements have been repealed. These areas are mostly built out or have been permitted development under the old zone. Staff have been looking at these areas for the future in case someone voluntarily removes a home and desires to rebuild. Staff are looking at what guidelines the commission would want to see in these areas of the city where the zoning no longer applies. The R-3 and R5-6 Land Use Zones and the planned developments are the zones staff are looking at. The R-3 allows for multi-family/higher density housing. R5-6 is similar. Commissioner Morales asked if any of these homes match our current zoning. Sarah Wichern said no and that is the issue. There is nothing in the current city code to address zoning requirements for these repealed zoning areas. Staff are looking for requirements for these zones and any other considerations in order to write a replacement zone. The new zone could contain some of the old requirements. Commissioner Hempel asked if the city would be in trouble for changing the density for these areas. Jennie Knight said if something were to happen in one of these areas, the parcel is grandfathered into its current zoning which has no requirements. Council has asked the commission to address this.

Sarah Wichern continued by saying we do not currently have really great zoning regulations for townhomes or apartments. She asked if this was something the commission would like to figure out as well. We have vague directions in our mixed-use codes which address townhomes and are not specific. The commission could create a couple of different zones to address this and apply it during a future general plan update.

Chair Francom said some of the suggestions we would need to address are items regarding moderate density. We will also need to consider single-family versus multi-family in the language. Sarah Wichern added we could make a multi-family type of zone or a single-family higher density zone. The way the code is written the smallest zone we have is R-1-10 which is about three (3) units per acre with roads. The code is currently written for the size of the lot required for development. We are moving in the direction of stating how many units are an acre to allow flexibility. For instance, as long as you have no more than six (6) units per acre you can develop as desired. This direction makes it easier for the developer and gives the city more variety. This also seems to be the general trend. Chair Francom clarified that the reason for this discussion is to have some language in the code to address these areas.

Sarah Wichern suggested adding three (3) different zones such as high density or multi-family/apartment, townhomes, and smaller single-family in the future. For now, she would like them to consider a smaller single-family zone which would be consistent in this area.

Commissioner Hempel asked how many zones the city has retired. Sarah Wichern answered we have repealed three (3) zones. We currently have four (4) residential zones that are not special use or an overlay; A-1, R-1-20, R-1-15, and R-1-10. Commissioner Holbrook said it would make sense to him to design something to match square footage or lot sizes to what is currently existing. Sarah

Wichern said she was thinking about having something between the HOAZ and the R-1-10. If looking at higher density, we could update the mixed-use zoning currently in place.

After some discussion the commission decided to wait on the highest density (multi-family/apartment) and townhomes zones and work on a smaller single-family home zones which have smaller lot sizes than the R-1-10. This new zone would replace all three (3) repealed zones for the R-3, R5-6, and the R-1-6 Land Use Zones. The committee and staff discussed the options. The smallest lot size would be 5,000 square feet lots with an average of no more than 4 ½ units per acre utilizing the HOAZ ordinance setbacks and lot frontages. They also agreed with Jennie Knight's suggestion to begin their next discussion by reviewing the standards currently applied to these repealed areas to get an average.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS – (3 minute maximum)

There were no public comments.

8. COMMISSION/STAFF FOLLOW-UP

Jennie Knight reminded the commissioners to complete their training hours and to send to the staff any certificates or completed reading hours. Staff will send the commissioners' links for online land use training through the APA and ULCT. The League will have land use training at their fall conference. Information will be sent to the commissioners by staff.

9. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Palmer motioned to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Morales seconded the motion. Motion passed with all in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 8:18 PM.

**Angie Francom
Chair**

**Cynthia Benson
Deputy Recorder**