



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 6, 2024

Commission Members Present: Cindy Allen, Jay Bair, Cache Christensen, Brock Mecham, Brent Wallis

Staff Present: Justin Lewis (City Recorder), HollyJo Karren (City Administrator), Amber Ervin (Council Member)

Others In Attendance: None

Chairman Brent Wallis called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Approval of the April 2, 2024 meeting minutes

Jay moved to approve the minutes from the April 2, 2024, Planning Commission meeting. Cache seconded the motion, which was approved 5-0.

Yes Vote: Allen, Bair, Christensen, Mecham, Wallis

No Vote: None

Continued discussion for framework and assignments on a new multi-family zoning ordinance.

Brent explained that Mayor Erickson requested that the Planning Commission discuss and provide recommendations to the City Council on affordable housing options, specifically creating a new multi-family zone.

Brock said the current height maximum in Richmond is 35-feet, which seems to be the standard in surrounding cities, except for Logan City, which has denser zones and multi-family developments. The rear setback is a minimum of 30-feet, matching other comparable towns in Cache Valley.

Jay pointed out that some multi-family developments have alleys/private roads that access garages.

Brent said one of the challenges is ensuring a financially feasible zone; otherwise, it would be pointless because it would not be used.

Justin pointed out an item of clarification: Other cities are allowing and/or considering a 50-foot height maximum for three stories. Brent agrees that 35-feet might be a little restrictive but realizes that may not be the general consensus of citizens.

Cache said height might be able to work with the open space initiative that was passed last year. Jay noted that some cities have codified a percentage bonus (e.g., if certain metrics are met, like open space or other variables). Logan City's mixed-use zone uses this type of matrix. Brent asked what burden this would put on staff to enforce. Justin said there will be an engineer who will need to review the project; there will also have to be very specific and clear requirements to follow. Staff would generally favor allowing a 50-foot height maximum because it will be less expensive than sprawling outward. The Code will have to dictate carefully what is expected. All requirements are noted and recorded on the final plat.

Brent asked what setbacks the members were comfortable with. Cache thinks the front setback should allow a vehicle to park comfortably in the driveway without blocking the sidewalk. Justin pointed out that the garage and house setbacks can be different, allowing a greater setback for the garage to enable parking. Brent will set the setback at 30-feet for the draft matrix he will put together. Brock said the back setback could be reduced to have more in the front. Justin mentioned that some cities prefer a larger backyard to have patios and play areas in the back yard. Jay said a 20-foot side setback allows for a utility corridor. HollyJo has not heard any complaints about the current requirements. Justin suggested taking into consideration window wells and overhangs. Brent thinks 20-foot side setbacks (foundation to foundation) should allow for those features not to encroach into the setback. Brent stated the requirements can be tweaked as the ordinance is developed.

Cindy said Richmond is much different from Logan, and the more space allowed, the more appealing it will be. Jay agreed but noted that many people prefer townhome living so they do not have to care for large yards. Multi-family can offer many designs for various life cycles.

Cache created a mission statement by gathering information from the recently updated General Plan. Richmond City strives to foster a vibrant, sustainable, and inclusive City that prioritizes its residents' well-being and quality of life, along with the vitality of its community. We are committed to creating a livable, small urban environment that prioritizes pedestrians and cyclists in our infrastructure planning, supports the growth of small businesses, and embraces small, incremental development to ensure a balanced and organic evolution of our neighborhoods. The goal of the zone is to enhance the lives of the citizens of Richmond. The vision is for this development to be small and incremental, harmonize with its surroundings, repurpose older buildings when feasible, utilize infill development to optimize space usage and promote the integration of bike paths and sidewalks. Cache said it is important that this zone be accessible for people with disabilities, which in turn helps everyone.

Brent thinks creating a walkable/bikeable community is a great idea, but it may be several years away. One big challenge is the UDOT (Utah Department of Transportation) highway, which bifurcates the City.

HollyJo also suggested having single-family homes on the project's perimeter, with taller homes/buildings in the interior. This style offers a buffer zone.

Brock asked about the allowed uses within this zone (e.g., single-family homes, churches, mixed-use designs) and what would be allowed or conditionally allowed. Justin said the City could develop a use matrix listing what would be allowed in that zone.

Jay likes the concept of a distinct zone instead of simply adding overlays. Justin concurred that overlays are challenging to comprehend and enforce. Jay suggested specifying the geographical approval for this zone rather than just remaining 2,000 feet apart. Brent pointed out the necessity of considering the size of the developments.

Open Space: Cindy said River Heights requires 25% open space, which she thinks is too small. Smithfield and Richmond require 40% open space. One question is whether parking areas should be considered open spaces; members did not think they should be.

Parking: Cache said parking is essential; however, the project may not be financially viable if the requirement is too high. Concerns arise during overnight snow removal months. Justin mentioned the need for dedicated parking near amenities. Cache also suggested shared parking resources, like tenants using a business lot overnight and customers utilizing the stalls during the day. Various scenarios were discussed, and this initial draft may require three stalls, particularly if the units have garages. Amber asked about the impact of implementing apartments with covered carports on the required parking.

HollyJo pointed out that if the carport has a roof and is attached, it is considered part of the structure (whether enclosed or not). Justin said snow removal times are the most concerning for staff; no size fits all, and parking is complicated. He encouraged members to drive around Richmond Village to understand some concerns.

Brent said amenities should not be required; they should be market-driven; however, if they have one, an HOA (Homeowner's Association) should be established to keep them up.

About landscaping, Cache would like trees along sidewalks. HollyJo said trees in park strips can be difficult and costly to maintain. Justin agreed it costs quite a bit to trim, replace, and keep all those trees. Cache said Providence has a list of trees that can be provided to developers. Brock would like to develop a rule about how close they can be to an intersection.

Cache provided information regarding Trash/Snow Removal/Lighting/Storage in an email before the meeting.

Lighting: Cache asked how invested the City is. Justin said one LED streetlight which was recently installed cost \$6,000. Brent suggested including light-sky-friendly and softer lighting for inner neighborhoods. Brent will reference the PUD (Planned Unit Development) Code and put that information together.

Density: Jay said height and setbacks could be increased; in some developments, it might be good to consider 50-feet depending on the massing of the building and design. Amber noted that the community's consensus is to create a good standard for Richmond. HollyJo asked what the average height is on a successful multi-family project. Jay said most of his have been townhomes. He has done one at 45-feet high because the main floor was for

commercial space and had a higher ceiling. It could depend on the steepness and design of the roof. Brent will put 45-feet into the draft matrix for more discussion.

Justin said developers want a fair and consistent standard with what is happening in the community. Amber said we have to decide whether building up or out is better.

Justin said developers want a standard that is consistent with what else is happening. The community is more worried about density rather than height. Amber said the City can build up and save space or expand out and not be as tall. Brock agreed that it would depend on where it is located.

Cache said the multi-family zone is broad and can entail many housing needs with small incremental development. HollyJo reminded the Commission that the State will provide a mandate if the City cannot develop something. Amber also said to ensure enough access in/out of the development.

Brent likes Smithfield City's bonus density program. Jay said projects provide a variety of options. Brent thinks ten units per acre might be a good start. Jay said there needs to be more discussion about what type of density bonuses will be allowed and what amenities will be proposed.

Design: Jay said this can be variable; the product will be more expensive if too many things are required. The requirement could specify the need for long-lasting, durable material. Amber thinks developers have rights, but the City can dictate what Richmond should look like overall. Justin asked how "long-lasting, durable materials" would be dictated. A developer will make the product appealing because they want it to sell.

Brent will put all the discussion items from tonight into a draft matrix, which will be reviewed and further discussed at the next meeting. This discussion has been a good start.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Sept. 3, 2024.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Planning Commission Chairperson