

COUNTY OF SEVIER CITY OF RICHFIELD

At the Planning Commission
In and for said City
January 8, 2025

Minutes of the Richfield City Planning Commission meeting held on Wednesday, January 8, at 6:00 p.m., Chairman Josh Peterson, presiding.

1. Roll Call
2. Development review/Ordinance Amendment Proposal
5. General Plan update
6. Minutes Approval
7. Other Business
8. Adjournment.

1. Roll Call

2. Present: Josh Peterson, Blaine Breinholt, Branden Anderson, Lisa White, Wes Kirshner, Zach Leavitt.
Excused: Wayne Cowley.
Also, Alexa Wilson, Aubrey Larsen, Mark Vlasic, Marnee Winn, Kylee Boyter and Michael Snow.

3. Development review/Ordinance amendment proposal – Utah State Trust Lands to discuss proposal for development of property located north and east of Eagle View.

Alexa Wilson addressed the commission. She said SITLA manages millions of acres across the state with the mandate of generating money for K-12 education in Utah. Some 23 acres of SITLA land is near Walmart in Richfield. SITLA's representatives came in April and wanted to rezone their land to RM-11. However, at the time RM-11 was under consideration to be changed, which meant the proposal would no longer qualify. She said SITLA wanted to find a better way. At that point the ideas were very vague. Aubrey Larsen and Mark Vlasic of Landmark Design have come up with a plan that is expansive and comprehensive. She said SITLA is really excited about it, and hopes this plan will lead to a win-win situation.

Aubrey Larsen said she would like the bulk of the time is to have to gather feedback on the project. She first started explaining the various components of the plan.

A lot of the concept is aimed at aligning future development with the vision for Richfield, especially along the eastern edge. She said for the purposes of the discussion, the area is being referred to as the east central neighborhood.

The timeline for the project started back in May, as SITLA visited with City staff and gather great feedback on the project on the concerns and opportunities Richfield sees. In June, SITLA visited with the planning commission to hear the feedback and concerns.

In August there was a workshop with city leadership and experts. The takeaway from that workshop was that it's important to have diverse housing options of all

1 types from young families to the elderly. Using that feedback, the idea of the
2 overlay ordinance was developed, as well as the vision plan for the area. She
3 explained some of the options discussed during the August workshop.
4 The vision for the area is to try and address the missing middle – create a missing
5 middle overlay zone. Missing middle would include duplexes, townhomes and
6 smaller lot homes. It's important to keep small town feel, the City wants to be
7 proactive, but has some reluctance to changing the zone. One of the concerns
8 voiced in the past was that the higher density housing has benefited developers,
9 but not really the people who live here. Affordable options that work for the
10 residents in all stages in life.

11 During the workshop, people were asked to write pros and cons on each one on
12 three posters. Concept A provided more space for ATVs, trucks and the like.
13 However, it doesn't solve affordability issues. Concept B would use the R1-6
14 Zone, which would increase density and affordability. However, it felt like maybe
15 too much density in one place.

16 Concept C – missing middle scenario – scaled buildings with multiple units
17 blended with different housing types. Townhomes, cottage courts, a multiuse
18 center and other amenities. 

19 Comments included liking the mix of housing options, uncertainty of business
20 spaces being used, and concerns that it doesn't fit current zoning.

21 Different affordable housing strategies could include a small area plan, which
22 guides the future development of a specific area within a city or district. It's
23 really the vision that guides decisions on types of units and infrastructure
24 development. The overlay zone is a regulatory tool that creates a special zoning
25 district placed over an existing base zone.

26 The vision plan would paint the vision for the area. An overlay ordinance is how it
27 would be executed. The purpose of the vision plan is to provide diverse and
28 affordable homes, with single family homes as a base, townhomes, duplex,
29 fourplex types in the overlay zone.

30 Information such as roads and other existing infrastructure as well as accounting
31 for a high-water table in the area are also included in the vision plan.



32
33 The objectives are to align with Richfield's future vision, introduce appropriate
34 zoning solutions and development strategies, encourage affordable options,
35 preserve community character and incorporate amenities.



36 Mark Vlasic said this is something he has a lot of experience in - writing
37 code. He presented two documents. Both would be moved forward to the City
38 Council with a recommendation from the Planning Commission. The zoning code
39 is based on the small area plan, and could be adopted as an addendum to the
40 existing general plan. This is kind of cutting edge in Utah. All the talk is about the
41 missing middle right now, various communities are looking at how to deal with
42 the missing middle. This may be the first such ordinance in the state of Utah to
43 address it specifically. He said he didn't want it to be onerous, but also wanted to
44 avoid creating issues as some zoning districts have in the past. His group has
45 done a lot of research in the state.

Each application made by individual applicants would have the base zone, which is R1-10 lots. Less than the RM-11, gives more units, but they have to give a lot in exchange. They would have a density in total of nine units per acre. The PC leads the process by which it is approved. Have the opportunity to see if it is not used. R1-10 would be the base zone if they are not approved for the overlay.



Maximum height would be three stories, everything else would be one to two stories. Some of the small lot residences would be smaller – approximately 4,500 square feet per lot. Allows applicants to mix and match. No more than 60 percent of one type of housing types would be allowed in any one development. Vlasic said they want to avoid a monolithic neighborhood that is all the same type of housing – create something that meets wishes and desires of the community, while hitting different price points. It would also create more interesting neighborhoods, and require open space and trails.

The goal would be to meet a wider range of needs with significant gives back to the community in the form of open space and trails.

The concept wouldn't allow any development smaller than two acres. One acre would be hard to do something like this, so at least two would be a better fit.



While there are concerns about services, housing does contribute to tax rolls, which could help offset some of those costs. Whether it pays for itself is up for debate.

Commercial could be allowed on a small-scale basis, providing places where people could simply walk to get a gallon of milk or other things, rather than have to drive.

Parks and trails would be a central part of this. Vlasic said SITLA is aware that this is sensitive land and agricultural land. As the City gets more pressure, as it probably will in the future, this is a plan that could help guide the City. It may in the longer run affect people's desire to continue agriculture in the area in the future.



The setbacks and site requirements were the next topic discussed by Vlasic. This is more about the function and relationships between different types of buildings rather than just focusing on the land use.

Townhomes can be two story or three story with detached garages. The maximum number in a row has been defined. Every six units have to have an opening of 15 feet. The proposal provides a lot of leeway in how it is designed. Next is the cottage court type with a shared open space, parking in the back. They would be laid out in a U-shape typically.

Small scale business/housing use was the next component discussed. It is becoming more popular. Trying to get a shop or a daycare in the neighborhood with apartments on the upper floors. It would add some flavor and services to the neighborhood.



Each development must include a minimum of two housing types, especially for larger developments. Code would spell out the density – gross or net – with a maximum of nine units per acre. They'd have to spell out a master plan in the application. It would have to meet the requirements and the Planning Commission would have to recommend it to the City Council, with the council

1 providing the final legislative decision. It would be a zone change as an optional
2 overlay. There would be a lot of detail gathered by the applications and the
3 process, but it will require a little bit more give and take.

4 The goal is to encourage development in the best way. It would not be done as
5 quick as a quarter acre lot.

6 Developers would come to the planning commission for the overlay, Vlasic said.
7 He said in order to implement this it would be a two-step process – first the
8 vision plan adopted, then adding the ordinance on the books. What’s exciting
9 about this could be applied in different areas. The goal is to get diversity of
10 housing and some more affordable housing. It helps provide local people a
11 chance to get their foot in the door in the housing market.



12 Chairman Peterson asked if developers apply for the overlay zone, are they
13 restricted to the patio home, town home and cottage court.

14 Vlasic said they could also do the quarter acre lots as it’s the underlying zone.
15 This would be an R1-10 with the option missing middle overlay. It could be
16 defined on the zoning map.

17 Chairman Peterson said his primary concern is that the city not open itself up to
18 another large apartment complex. Vlasic said it would not. The maximum height
19 of any of the buildings would be three stories.

20 Commission White asked for clarification as to the maximum of nine units per
21 acre.

22 Vlasic said it would limit it to the nine units per acre, but on a different scale. It’s
23 not saying they can’t do anything, but the sky is the limit for what they want to fit
24 into the requirements up to the nine units. They would still have to provide for
25 the open space. The applicants would have to do some good design work. The
26 trump card is that if they are not meeting the requirements, they would have to
27 go back to the drawing board.

28 Commissioner White said she loves the variety and concept of mixed-use
29 development. The base issue is clustering large groups of people together. It’s
30 still fuzzing that line a little bit, which is a concern.

31 Chairman Peterson said he agrees. The community’s most pressing need is single
32 family housing. What the overlay zone provides is still single-family homes, but it
33 is more condensed. He said he is still OK with it because it is providing for that
34 need in a different way than what is currently available.

35 Commissioner White said her concern is specific to this area. This would be
36 clustering more people in an area where the City already has a significant cluster
37 of people. This would be clustering more people with minimal infrastructure and
38 circulation.

39 Chairman Peterson said the developers would have to address the infrastructure
40 needs.

41 Commissioner Anderson asked how to avoid having it expanded to other areas.
42 How does the City limit it?

43 Vlasic said another area would need to have a whole new overlay zone.

44 Chairman Peterson said this overlay zone would be for a defined area, and not
45 offered to zones outside of that area.

46 Vlasic said they would have to create a whole new overlay zone. Not suggesting
47 that it be applied, but if its successful, it could be used.

Commissioner White said the land around the SITLA holdings is mostly pasture land with bucking cows. It would be remaining agricultural in nature for the foreseeable future. Her family owns much of it.

Michael Snow, a public member, said the problem it brings up to him is like when Winkle built the subdivision on the north end of town. The City helped pay for sewer and water to it. Then someone came in off of State Route 118 and asked if the City did it for him, why not for them? There is some land off of 500 South, and they may ask why it was given to SITLA but not to them?

Vlasic said it's not supported by a small area plan and it's not where the city has wanted to target that type of use right now.

Snow it still brings up the issue of this "development company got it, why can't I?" The other issue is that the proposed common areas also could bring in more HOAs into the community. This would increase the costs for homeowners. Once started, the HOA can continue to increase costs and regulations on homeowners. Most are just in the condominiums.

Commissioner Anderson also asked about the density. He said there is a stipulation that there not be more than 60 percent of one kind of housing. The developers will go with the highest density they can if it's in the code. Developer is going to do what makes them the most profit - 60 percent as the highest density, then 40 percent the next highest. Then it's not really a mix.

Vlasic said that part of the proposed code could be modified to force more of a true mix.

Commissioner White said this is really putting dense populations in small areas, which we've been trying to avoid.

Chairman Peterson said the city has approved R1-8 in one area, R1-6 by the golf courts and hasn't done any R1-10. None of them have done anything, no dirt has moved. Nothing has happening and there are not lots available in Richfield. He said the city has tried lots of concepts before with no results, but he is listening to this proposal.

Commissioner Anderson said he likes the idea of the missing middle focus. The idea is good, how do you get that mix?

Vlasic said they could up the minimum development size up to five acres and do 30/30/30.

Chairman Peterson said there could be a two-acre requirement, and a five-acre requirement. He said he would like every type of building called out in the list – including duplexes and four-plexes. Like to see every kind that is allowed in the overlay zone called out. The City can either choose to do an RM-9 like what we're creating, or we'll get stuck with the RM-11 or 24. The City may have to deal with some clustering.

Commissioner Leavitt said he would like to see some language addressing more of the missing middle housing as far as duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. This is the right direction, but he'd like to see the concerns addressed. Make sure it's just not a backdoor to just increasing density.

Commissioner White said Richfield City's general plan is a small area plan.  She said she doesn't know if it makes sense given the level of development being sought, and the community character Richfield is trying to keep. Trying to

1 separate it off into neighborhoods like you would in the Wasatch Front doesn't
2 make as much sense in Richfield, because Richfield is not a Wasatch Front type of
3 city. She said it doesn't feel applicable to a town this size.

4 Michael Snow asked if the city has a planned unit development still, similar to
5 what was done with the Centennial Park development. If the city still has that, it
6 could use that instead of the overlay zone. It's a longer process, come in with the
7 PUD and present it.

8 Chairman Peterson said he likes the overlay more because it puts the city in the
9 driver's seat. The developer would have to figure out how to fit the
10 requirements.

11 Commissioner White asked what the advice has been as far as avoiding overlay
12 zones?

13 Chairman Peterson said at the last R6 conference during all the Ombudsman
14 classes the theme was the overlays are a great tool. Attorneys all have their own
15 opinion. There is no magic stick to make it better. In this situation, it gives the
16 city more control. The commission agrees that single family, owner occupied
17 residencies are what should be pursued.

18 Commissioner Breinholt asked who would be moving into these units? Are they
19 all from California? What economic opportunities would bring people here? He
20 said he spoke with someone from Sedona, Arizona, a town roughly the size of
21 Richfield. He said that community is being bought up by people from California –
22 retirees or whatever. Job opportunities here are not great.

23 Chairman Peterson said there was a large industrial facility that wanted to build
24 in the Salina business park, but there was no housing for employees. It's a
25 chicken or the egg situation. Smiths sold it to the community as they were going
26 to build housing for their employees. Once they got in, it was changed to low
27 income housing. Build it and they will come. We built it and they came, but they
28 don't have jobs.

29 Commissioner Anderson said it's been a problem in the valley. The area doesn't
30 have enough people here to support it. We can't guess who's going to come in.
31 Have the ordinance in place.

32 Michael Snow said with Smiths, they allowed the apartments and they never
33 built the meat factory.

34 Vlastic said he has been looking at models like this to prevent the housing
35 communities don't like. Across the state there is a push for smaller lot homes.



36
37 Chairman Peterson said one benefit with this type of development is that its
38 more for people who already have jobs or who are more financially stable. Also,
39 a lot of younger and older people don't want yards.

40 Michael Snow asked if the city knows how many lots the city could have? How
41 many more townhomes across from the Topsfield. The Villa, there are already a
42 lot of units being developed. There are a lot already approved.

43 Chairman Peterson said the city has approved a lot of zones and opportunities
44 with nothing happening.

45 Michael Snow asked if the state going to develop this, or are they just going to
46 sell it off to a developer and have the same thing happen again? He said he feels
47 like the state would likely sell it off.

1 Alexa Wilson said what generally happens is the state usually partners with a
2 developer. SITLA holds onto the land, the developer puts in the infrastructure,
3 once it sells, SITLA will get a percentage. SITLA has learned that contracts have to
4 have a timeline. They do tend to be somewhat flexible as you can't force
5 someone to build a home without profit.

6 Snow said what does that say about this type of development?

7 Wilson said the hope is that since this is a more condensed, it will be more
8 economically viable and will be built. Plan like this will provide single family
9 housing that's a little more condensed and making homes more affordable.

10 There is no guarantee.

11 Chairman Peterson asked if the City Council would have a presentation given to
12 them.

13 Vlasic said he would like to update the documents based on tonight's discussion
14 and then present it to the city council.

15 Deputy Clerk Anderson said if the ordinance is amended, there would have to be
16 a public hearing. From that point, if the commission recommended it, it would go
17 to the council.

18 Commissioner Leavitt said he likes the direction this discussion is going.

19 Commissioner Kirshner said he likes most of this proposal. There are a few things
20 he doesn't like, but overall, he likes it. Going in the right direction. Has a good
21 mix to it. Outside of that, it is going in the right direction.

22 Vlasic said one way to get around adding more HOAs would be to turn over
23 common spaces to the city for use as public parks. The trails and park systems
24 should be part of the community, according to the proposed code. There
25 wouldn't need to be an HOA.

26 Deputy Clerk Anderson said the City Council would like to have some input into
27 the process as turning over new trails and parks to the city has a very real impact
28 on the operation budget of the city.

29 Commissioner Breinholt said it is a good thing. He said Richfield's golf course is
30 maintained by the least number of people for a golf course in the state, yet it
31 ranks number five for the number of rounds played.

32 Anderson said the city makes due with the least it can, but that means staff is
33 stretched already.

34 Commissioner Peterson said he likes the idea of the overlay zone giving the city
35 control over what can be there besides quarter acre lots. The city needs more
36 owner occupied, single family homes. His fear is opening the door to more
37 Smiths apartments.

38 Alexa Wilson asked if it would make sense to have a diagram of how the mix
39 would be. It may help to have a rendering that shows exactly how it would work.

40 Commissioner Breinholt said this is going to be a more expensive area to build on
41 due to the type of soil, and the higher water table.

42 Commissioner White said she likes the idea of a mixed development; however,
43 she is hesitant about the idea of increased density in this area specifically. Right
44 now, and for the foreseeable future much of this area will be used for
45 agricultural benefit, so dumping a lot of people across the street from literal
46 bucking cows may be a bad idea. She said the cattle in the area can be deadly
47 and that the fences have had to be reinforced. People from surrounding

1 developments may want to pet the cute cows not realizing how dangerous they
2 can be. It's a very, very long-term plan. Adding that level of density to an area
3 that is not ready for it is not good. She said he does like the diversity of the types
4 of housing. There are also impacts to the water structure. Every project out there
5 has affected the agricultural uses. The reason it is agricultural land is because of
6 the water table structure in the area. The higher density development impacts
7 agricultural uses more. She said her father owned some property in the area in
8 question, but there was a drain that was plugged due to one of the
9 developments and it has had detrimental effects to the agricultural uses ever
10 since.

11 Chairman Peterson said the Eagle View development is where a lot of the first
12 responder resources are used. It may be surpassed by Sandstone, but that is
13 where part of the frustration lies.

14 Commissioner White said the more people there are, the more emergency
15 responders will be needed.

16 Commissioner Breinholt said he really likes the whole idea. Those field drains
17 installed by the pioneers all through the valley helped drop the water table. All
18 this development, the developers don't care and cut them off and they don't
19 drain. This whole area is not the best area to build.

20 Wilson said part of the role of the city and staff is to make sure the drainage is
21 taken care of.

22 Breinholt said part of the problem is that most of the people who knew where
23 the field drains are located are now dead.

24 Commissioner Anderson said he likes the idea of the overlay. He said he'd like to
25 see a minimum development based on at least three of those types rather than
26 two. He also like to see some of the other types added to the working, including
27 the duplex and three-plex into it. Try and force the diversity of housing instead of
28 allowing developers to go with the two highest densities and that's it.

29 Vlasic said one thing that should be added to the code is that any developer
30 should have to have a hydrological impact and mitigation report for development
31 in this area. 

32 33 4. General Plan Update –

34 Michael Hansen, consultant, discussed the draft general plan, which he is
35 assisting the city in creating.  He spoke about the annexation policy, and the
36 schedule of what's coming up.

37 There is always access to the general plan online. He shared a URL where people,
38 including those in the community, where comments can be uploaded. The
39 comments are public. Michael said he will go in afterward and see if the
40 comments make sense and either approve or disapprove them. Comments that
41 go beyond a simple correction or that may be controversial can be discussed by
42 the planning commission before adoption.

43 The annexation policy document needs some attention. It will need to be
44 discussed in a joint meeting with the city council. Annexation issues in the city
45 needed to be tightened up. The annexation policy is something that will need

1 input from the city. He presented a map showing the annexable area around
2 Richfield City.

3 There are also some islands in the city, which a good policy statement needs to
4 be drafted to address. There needs to be a policy for the areas that are super-
5 highly likely to be annexed and what zoning designations they would be assigned
6 when brought into the City. There also has to be some type of criteria defined for
7 allowing or disallowing property from being annexed into the City – it really can't
8 be on an individual, case-by-case basis.

9 There is also a section where the City has to coordinate with the County as to
10 what the future annexations fit with each other. There are also new applications
11 that are designed to ask all the questions and gather all the information upfront
12 when dealing with annexations. They will include title work, certifications of
13 ownership and other information.

14 Deputy Clerk Anderson asked if someone was applying with the intent of having
15 an annexation denied, would they still be required to fill out the same extensive
16 application?

17 Kendall Welch said she feels it would have to be the same application form.

18 Chairman Peterson said he'd hope that the city wouldn't require the same
19 amount of effort for a denial as for one that actually wants to be in the city.

20 Hansen said that is a good point to address.

21 Another area to look at was the downtown plan. Our take away for that plan, is
22 the city wants Main Street to be alive, but not nitpick every use. However, some
23 uses shouldn't be allowed.

24 There was also some work done on the Transportation Master Plan. Some of this
25 draft of the general plan was pulled from the Transportation Master Plan to help
26 the city have justification as it tries to justify future intersections and traffic
27 signals.

28 One comment received is "how do you say yes to higher density without
29 attracting the problems of higher density." We want the city to be the city and
30 the country to be the country, but at the same time we want to avoid clustering
31 the city developments so tightly. The goal is to keep the small-town atmosphere
32 – look at section 7.04.

33 Next, Hansen talked about the calendar for the upcoming meetings, where the
34 plan will be broken up into digestible packets. During the next meeting there will
35 be some discussion about land use, which is the core of the general plan. There is
36 also going to be a meeting with the Commission and the Council where the two
37 entities can look at the land use map.

38 Deputy Clerk Anderson said some members of the commission may not be able
39 to attend every time, but the body as a whole is planning on the extra meetings.

40 Another thing that has to be done is creating a high-level description of each
41 type of the seven zoning profiles that is understandable to the layperson. Hansen
42 said he would be writing those.

43 Next would be strategic priorities, which the City will have to develop.

44 Hansen said he encourages planning commission members to log onto the online
45 version of the plan and make suggestions.

Commissioner White asked if the best way to make comments is using the document? Deputy Clerk Anderson said making comments on the document may be the best way to have them included and looked at by everyone.

5. Consider approving minutes of meeting hosted Dec. 3, 2024. **Motion:** Table minutes until the next meeting. **Action:** Table, **Moved by** Blaine Breinholt, **seconded by** Lisa White. The motion carried with Josh Peterson, Blaine Breinholt, Branden Anderson, Lisa White, Wes Kirshner, Zach Leavitt voting aye. Wayne Cowley was excused.

6. **Other Business**

Chairman Peterson spoke about the property development ordinance concerning curb and gutter. In the previous meeting the Planning Commission discussed the concept of giving a waiver to a pair of property owners who didn't want to install improvements, including curb, gutter and asphalt shoulder. The City Council granted the waiver, which is the fourth one granted in a row. Clearly the ordinance is not what is happening, perhaps it needs to be looked at. Having years of roadway and curb and gutter design, Peterson said once water is channelized, there has to be a plan as to where it will go. If there is no storm drain system, or plan, you are making mess. If the city is just putting in curb and gutter in haphazardly it's not really solving a problem. The ordinance needs to be looked at.

One also runs the risk of the putting in curb and gutter that doesn't have the correct elevations, and having to put it in twice. It needs to be revisited.

Commissioner Kirshner said it didn't get waived for him, and he had to put in some \$16,000 of improvements.

Blaine, we were very adamant about it. The curb and gutter should be designed by the city engineer. They should have a plan.

Commissioner Kirshner said he and his neighbor ended up doing an entire block of a city street and paid to cover the ditch the canal company has nothing to do with other than the water that goes in it. The curb and gutter has to have a purpose. Somebody above or below him won't have proper drainage. The school district is way off on its property.

Chairman Peterson said something has to happen.

The information sign at city park also should be updated and fixed, Chairman Peterson said. The city should find money to do it.

7. **Adjournment.** **Motion:** Adjourn the meeting, **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Blaine Breinholt, **Seconded by** Wes Kirshner. **The motion passed** with a unanimous roll call vote with commissioners Josh Peterson, Blaine Breinholt, Zach Leavitt, Wes Kirshner, Brandon Anderson and Lisa White. Wayne Cowley was excused.