



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, October 1, 2024

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

Staff Present: Justin Lewis (City Recorder), HollyJo Karren (City Administrator)

Others in Attendance: Joel Draxler, Terrie Wierenga, Bernell Kerkman, Tim & Stacey Taylor, Blake & Rhonda Davis

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

Approval of the September 3, 2024 meeting minutes

*****Jay moved to approve the September 3, 2024, Planning Commission meeting minutes. Cindy seconded the motion. Motion approved 5-0.*****

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

No Vote: None

Public Hearing for the purpose of discussing Ordinance 2024-13, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)", Chapter 12-2000 "Subdivision Regulations", Part 12-2003-4 "Final Plat Preparation and Required Information".

Mr. Lewis explained that this is adding the following paragraph, which was mistakenly removed earlier this year, back into the Code:

*12-2003-4 (D) **Financial Guarantee:** No site grading or construction of lots or of the public improvements required in this title shall be started unless and until the subdivider shall have furnished to the City a contractor's performance bond, an irrevocable letter of credit or funds in escrow an amount equal to at least one and one-quarter (1.25) times the reasonable value of the required public improvements, as determined by the Richmond City Engineer, to guarantee the complete and timely development of any facilities or improvements which are the subdivider's responsibility.*

6:32 p.m. Public Hearing Opened

There were not any comments or questions.

6:33 p.m. Public Hearing Closed

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2024-13

Brent had no objections and advised that this is relatively standard for municipalities throughout the state.

*****Cache moved to recommend approval to the City Council for Ordinance 2024-13, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)", Chapter 12-2000 "Subdivision Regulations", Part 12-2003-4 "Final Plat Preparation and Required Information. Jay seconded the motion. Motion approved 5-0.*****

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

No Vote: None

Initial discussion on Ordinance 2024-12, an Ordinance amending the Richmond City Municipal Code, Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management (LUDMO)", Chapter 12-900 "Zones" adding in its entirety Part 12-911 "Multi-Family Residential Zone "MF", Sections 12-911-1 "Purpose", 12-911-2 "Width, Density and Yard Regulations", 12-911-3 "Height Regulations", 12-911-4 "Modifying Regulations", 12-911-5 "Group Dwelling Standards", 12-911-6 "Parking, Loading and Access", 12-911-7 "Landscaping", 12-911-8 "Trash/Garbage", 12-911-9 "Development in Phases" and 12-911-10 "Allowed Uses".

Brent clarified that this is the first draft of the ordinance for the Commission to review and discuss tonight. There will be no public input; however, there will be a public hearing before it is approved and/or adopted. Justin pointed out that everything is subject to change, which is information from the discussion at the last meeting. The City Council will also do an initial review when the Commission feels ready to forward it to them.

Cindy noted that 12-911-5.B (2) (Open Space) should be 40% (as indicated in section 1). In 12-911-7, she suggested changing shrubs to a 2-gallon minimum with approval and possibly having perennials as a minimum of 1-gallon. Brent was worried about enforcing some of these requirements and how specific they need to be. He agreed that 2-gallon shrubs should winter just fine.

Cindy asked if VRBO (vacation rentals) would be an allowed use in 12-911-10. Cache said Richmond City has no restrictions on short-term rentals. Brent agreed that, given the lack of any legislation restricting them, the assumption is that they would be allowed. Justin noted that there is a process that requires an application and approval.

Cache said the 45-foot height was discussed, but one of the General Plan's priorities is to keep building heights at 35 feet. If the height is increased, he would like an articulated justification on record for the decision. This zone should be designed mainly for townhomes and duplexes. Apartments with a commercial component could be added to a multi-use zone that would help provide for a more natural trajectory for growth. Brent said a multi-use zone could be developed through a similar process to this zone. Jay noted that 45 feet does allow for more latitude, especially vertical design. Brent agreed and said that a 35-foot maximum limits some floor plan designs; increased height might help reduce

outward sprawl. Having a 10 unit per acre density might justify allowing more height. He wants to ensure that the ordinance will be usable; however, he agrees that height can be a concern. Determining locations where this zone might be allowed should be considered carefully. Brent, Cache, Brock, and Jay felt that 45 feet would be appropriate, and Cindy preferred 40 feet. The Commission agreed that location will be an essential factor.

Jay suggested adding verbiage in 12-911-5B (Open Space) to include community amenities. Justin pointed out that "recreational areas" are listed in B.1. Cache said there was a previous discussion about allowances for specific amenities, especially those highly desirable (e.g., requiring less maintenance, more water-efficient, or pet areas). Jay noted most HOA's will have rules and regulations dictating what is allowed for pets.

Jay pointed out that 12-911-6D lists four (4) parking spaces, but the minutes from the last discussion indicated that it should be three (3). Justin will make that change. Jay said Item C states, "Parking spaces shall not be provided within a front yard,"; however, if they have front-loading garages that face the street with only a small area for a front door – that is essentially the "front yard." Brent said if there are parking spaces in front of the home, it would be in the garage or driveway. He did not think front-facing garages would be part of the front yard; however, perhaps the consideration would be that it would be considered a driveway as long as it exceeds 12 inches from the width of the garage. Jay suggested that it be adjusted from 12 inches to 2 feet to allow for more room. Brent said it might be good to define what the front yard should be. Jay recommended adding that if it is a rear-loading garage, the front yard cannot be used for parking unless it is along the curb. Brent asked Jay to define "front yard" for discussion at the next meeting.

Jay recommended changing 12-911-2 Frontage from 75 feet to 80 feet. When townhomes are platted, this will allow for more latitude. Brent thought the frontage was related to the parcel, not the building width. Jay said twin homes might need more width, especially for a garage. The Commission agreed to increase the frontage to 80 feet.

Brock asked if a minimum width for parking spaces should be added to 12-911.6B for in/out access. Jay said that would be more applicable for a parking lot; most townhomes have drive aisles. Brock wondered about a minimum requirement or double access to avoid a bottleneck. Brent said there are no restrictions regarding ingress or egress; a looping street could become a problem. Jay said Fire Department access requirements would regulate this. At next month's meeting, Brent asked Brock to research parking lot design standards for more consideration and discussion.

Brent said the 1,500-foot minimum requirement between multi-family zones, as listed in 12-911-1, could potentially limit areas where this type of development would fit. The purpose of this requirement is to put this type of development on the outskirts of town and not encroach into block infill; however, there may be times when this could be restrictive. For example, development on both sides of the highway might be prohibited by this requirement. There could be significant development north of town where this zone could serve as a buffer between highway commercial and single-family development. He suggested changing it to a certain distance from a main road or another type of zone. For example, the zone might only be allowed on parcels that adjoin a commercial zone or within 1,500 feet of a defined main artery/road (e.g., any road that connects to Highway 91

via a traffic signal). Jay suggested setting a demographic area where the 1,500-foot requirement would be applicable, but in specified zones which might help keep Richmond rural and allow development to spread out organically. Justin said this zone can be exempted in specific geographically defined areas. Brent likes the idea of multi-family being a buffer between highway commercial and residential development which would be the perfect application for this ordinance. Cache does not like the current 2,000-foot requirement; he thinks one of the benefits of having a Planning Commission and City Council is the ability to consider rezone proposals on a case-by-case basis where public comments can be considered. One of his concerns is developing along the highway, which adds access points, slows traffic and increases accidents and congestion. Frontage roads might help make it safer. Brock agreed with Justin's suggestion of determining where this type of zoning would be allowed or exempted. The Commission reviewed areas along the highway that are currently zoned commercial. Brent recommended leaving the 1,500-foot statement with the exception that 1,500 feet does not apply to any parcel that abuts or adjoins highway commercial, industrial, manufacturing, or school zones.

Justin said the staff would like to rename the zone from Multi-Family (MF) to Residential Multi-Family (RMF).

Brent asked the Commission what they thought of bonus density allowances. Cache likes the idea of a bonus to encourage usable amenities such as walking paths/trails that integrate into nearby communities. Jay recommended a requirement that once development reaches a certain percentage of completion or phases amenities must be put in. Brent asked Cache to look at amenities and how to tie them into a bonus density allowance. He suggested reviewing Smithfield City's ordinance and developing a simplified version.

Jay questioned whether a certain number of units could be allowed per phase. Justin said it would be best to leave that up to the developer because factors such as the lay of the land, topography, and infrastructure could affect it.

The Commission discussed permitted/prohibited uses within the zone (matrix reviewed), including the following:

Prohibited Uses: feed yards, chickens, farm buildings, dairying, livestock, fur farms, feed yards, corrals, silage pits, gravel pits, stables, business/commercial (other retail uses that could be included in a future Mixed-Use ordinance)

Allowable Uses: single-family, agriculture uses (when applicable as a project is developing), home occupations (as a conditional and approved use), household pets, accessory buildings, cemetery, country clubs, produce stands, public utilities, schools, churches, flag poles, park/playgrounds, public buildings, art museums, library, splash pad.

Brent wants an addendum where each zone references the permitted uses.

Summary of Assignments and Proposed Changes to the Ordinance:

- ✓ Change 12-911-5B. 2 – first paragraph to "At least **forty percent (40%)** ..."
- ✓ Change 12-911-7D to "...shrubs shall be a minimum of two 2-gallon size".
- ✓ Change 12-911-6D to three (3) parking spaces instead of four (4).
- ✓ Change 12-911-2 Frontage from 75 feet to 80 feet
- ✓ Change 12-911-1 to add the wording "1,500 foot rule does not apply to parcels that abut or adjoin commercial, industrial, manufacturing, and school zones.
- ✓ Permitted/Prohibited uses as discussed.
 - Jay was asked to define "front yard" for discussion at the next meeting.
 - Brock asked to research parking design standards.
 - Cache was asked to look into amenities that should be tied into density bonuses.

Next meeting: Tues. Nov. 12, 2024 (second Tuesday due to the general election being held on November 5th)

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Planning Commission Chairperson