



**RIVERDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
CIVIC CENTER - 4600 S. WEBER RIVER DR.
TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2026**

5:30 p.m. – Planning Commission Meeting (Council Chambers)

****note earlier time – work session to follow****

A. Welcome & Roll Call

B. Public Comment

This is an opportunity to address the Planning Commission regarding your concerns or ideas. Please try to limit your comments to three minutes. No action will be taken during public comment.

C. Presentations and Reports

1. Community Development Update

D. Consent Items

1. [Consideration of Meeting Minutes from:](#)
December 23, 2025 Work Session
December 23, 2025 Regular Meeting

E. Action Items

1. Commission consideration, nomination, and voting to select Planning Commission Chair and, if necessary, Vice Chair Member.

F. Comments

1. Planning Commission
2. City Staff

G. Adjournment

6:00 p.m. (immediately following regular meeting) – Planning Commission Work Session (Conference Room)

The purpose of the work session is to review maps, plans, paperwork, etc. No motions or decisions will be considered during this session, which is open to the public.

A. Welcome & Roll Call

B. Planning Commission Training (6:00 – 6:30)

C. Discussion and continued work on Riverdale Zoning and Land Use Code Update

D. Adjournment

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons in need of special accommodation should contact the City Offices (801) 394-5541 at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Certificate of Posting

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder, does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted on this 9th day of January, 2026 at the following locations: 1) Riverdale City Hall Noticing Board 2) the City website at <http://www.riverdalecity.com/> and 3) the Public Notice Website: <http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>.

Michelle Marigoni
Riverdale City Recorder

Minutes of the **Work Session** of the Riverdale City **Planning Commission** held Tuesday December 23, 2025 at 5:30 p.m., at the Civic Center, 4600 S Weber River Dr, Riverdale City, Weber County, Utah.

Present:

Commissioners:	Kent Anderson, Chair Rikard Hermann, Vice Chair Colleen Henstra, Commissioner Alan Bowthorpe, Commissioner Jason Francis, Commissioner Laura Hilton, Commissioner
City Employees:	Brandon Cooper, Community Development Director Michelle Marigoni, City Recorder
Excused:	

A. Welcome & Roll Call

The Planning Commission Work Session began at 5:34 p.m. Commissioner Anderson welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated for the record that all members of the Planning Commission were present except for Commissioner Hermann. Members of the city staff were also present.

B. Public Comment

C. Presentations and Reports

1. Community Development Update

D. Consent Items

1. Consideration to approve 2026 Planning Commission Meeting schedule.
2. Consideration of Meeting Minutes from:
September 23, 2025 Work Session
September 23, 2025 Regular Meeting
November 25, 2025 Work Session
November 25, 2025 Work Session

E. Action Items

Mr. Cooper explained the order of the agenda and the procedure for opening and closing public hearings.

1. **Public Hearing** to review proposed text amendments to Riverdale City Code Title 10, Chapter 22 Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD).
2. Consideration to forward a recommendation to City Council for proposed text amendments to Riverdale City Code Title 10, Chapter 22 Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD).

Commissioner Anderson asked if there was a requirement in code to specify amenities being completed in certain phases. Mr. Cooper said it could be added as an amendment in the motion.

3. **Public Hearing** to receive and consider public comment regarding the following:
 - a. a proposed General Plan amendment which would modify the Riverdale City General Plan as it relates to the Future Land Use Map;

Mr. Cooper explained the general plan update needs to be approved or denied before addressing the rezone. The current future land use map in the general plan shows detached housing. The amendment would change the density of the future use to attached housing and would open it up to townhomes and/or apartments. There is currently a mixed-use overlay on the zone as well. The developers would do a development agreement, which could prevent the developers from deviating from any approved plan and provide a fail-safe to ensure the

rezone does not result in a completely different product. A traffic study was conducted and provided by the applicants, which Mr. Cooper went over, noting the study showed that Ritter Drive would not require modification to accommodate the increased traffic.

- b. a proposal to rezone approximately 4.35 acres at 1526 W Ritter Drive from the Single-Family Residential (R-1-8) zone to the Multiple Family Residential (R-4) zone.
4. Consideration to forward a recommendation to City Council regarding a proposed General Plan amendment which would modify the Riverdale City General Plan as it relates to the Future Land Use Map.
5. Consideration to forward a recommendation to City Council for proposed rezone of approximately 4.35 acres, located at 1526 W Ritter Drive, from Single-Family Residential (R-1-8) to Multiple-Family Residential (R-4).
6. **Consideration to approve the preliminary Burrows Subdivision, a 2-lot residential subdivision located at 937 West 4400 South, as requested by Bruce Burrows**

The subdivision's final determination is with the Planning Commission.

F. Comments

G. Adjournment

As there was no further business to discuss, the Planning Commission Work Session adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Date Approved:

Minutes of the **Regular Session** of the Riverdale City **Planning Commission** held Tuesday, December 23, 2025, at 6:00 p.m., at the Civic Center, 4600 S Weber River Drive., Riverdale City, Weber County, Utah.

Present:

Commissioners:	Kent Anderson, Chair Colleen Henstra, Commissioner Alan Bowthorpe, Commissioner Jason Francis, Commissioner Laura Hilton, Commissioner
City Employees:	Brandon Cooper, Community Development Director Michelle Marigoni, City Recorder
Excused:	Rikard Hermann, Vice Chair
Visitors:	Luke Martineau Rex & Jen Schwab Joe Gracey Nate Gracey Matthew White Janet Deschamp Melissa Carey Ben Carey Mike Dunkley

A. Welcome & Roll Call

The Planning Commission Meeting began at 6:00 p.m. Commissioner Anderson welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated for the record that all members of the Planning Commission were present. Members of the city staff were also present.

B. Public Comment

Commissioner Anderson opened the floor for public comments. There was no public comment.

C. Presentations and Reports

- Community Development Update

D. Consent Items

1. Consideration to approve 2026 Planning Commission Meeting schedule.
2. Consideration of Meeting Minutes from:
 - September 23, 2025 Work Session
 - September 23, 2025 Regular Meeting
 - November 25, 2025 Work Session
 - November 25, 2025 Work Session

Commissioner Bowthorpe moved to approve the consent items. Commissioner Francis seconded and all voted in favor.

E. Action Items

1. **Public Hearing** to review proposed text amendments to Riverdale City Code Title 10, Chapter 22 Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD).

Mr. Cooper presented background on the current code and the proposed changes.

MOTION: Commissioner Henstra moved to open the public hearing for proposed text amendments to Riverdale City Code Title 10, Chapter 22 Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD).

SECOND: Commissioner Bowthorpe

Commissioner Henstra:	Yes
Commissioner Hilton:	Yes
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent
Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Francis:	Yes
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes

Motion passed and the public hearing opened at 6:29 p.m.

Joe Gracey, who owns some properties on Ritter Drive, asked who wrote the new code and how long it took. He had a question about the multi-use being limited to 5 acres plus. Mr. Cooper explained the larger land use demand. He felt 5+ acres was unreasonable due to the small amount of space available in the city. He asked why the landscaping requirements were being changed when there has been no snow yet and the state offered money for dry landscaping. Mr. Cooper clarified the landscaping requirement is a ratio, which means the space the mature plants cover is calculated in the 75% requirement. (tree canopy over rock, etc.)

MOTION: Commissioner Henstra moved to close the public hearing

SECOND: Commissioner Bowthorpe

Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Hilton:	Yes
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent
Commissioner Francis:	Yes
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Henstra:	Yes

Motion passed and the public hearing closed at 6:37 pm.

2. Consideration to forward a recommendation to City Council for proposed text amendments to Riverdale City Code Title 10, Chapter 22 Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD).

Commissioner Henstra asked if the correction in section 2b needed to be included in the motion. Commissioner Anderson would like to see amenities addressed in the code, to be completed in the first phase of development or bonded to ensure they are followed through.

MOTION: Commissioner Henstra moved to forward a positive recommendation to City Council subject to following modifications: Section 2b corrected to 3 acres minimum for residential and five acres for commercial or mixed-use; Section 4b add amenity development to be completed in first phase or bonded; and finding the amendment:

- Is consistent with the Riverdale City General Plan
- Provides predictable and equitable application of regulations
- Establishes clear and objective standards, and
- Promotes the public health, safety, and general welfare of Riverdale City.

SECOND: Commissioner Bowthorpe

Commissioner Henstra:	Yes
Commissioner Francis:	Yes
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Hilton:	Yes
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent

Motion passed with 5 in favor and 1 absent.

3. **Public Hearing** to receive and consider public comment regarding the following:
- a proposed General Plan amendment which would modify the Riverdale City General Plan as it relates to the Future Land Use Map;
 - a proposal to rezone approximately 4.35 acres at 1526 W Ritter Drive from the Single-Family Residential (R-1-8) zone to the Multiple Family Residential (R-4) zone.

Mr. Cooper presented the information included in the packet and went over the proposed changes.

MOTION: Commissioner Bowthorpe moved to open the public hearing

SECOND: Commissioner Francis

Commissioner Hilton:	Yes
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent
Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Francis:	Yes
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Henstra:	Yes

Motion passed and the public hearing opened at 7:00 pm.

Public Comment – General Plan Amendment:

Janet Deschamp said if the general plan isn't changed, the rezone doesn't matter. It's always been a residential area, and the detached housing is going to be hard enough since they are used to a pasture, but three-story townhomes won't be cohesive with the current neighborhood. It used to be a country road and is already developed more than she would like. The townhomes would block their view of the mountains.

Melissa Carey asked why the new owner can change it when the previous owner was denied for R4 and had to do R6, and how is it legal for this owner to change it to multifamily. It looks good on the map as a transition, but that's not how it is when you are there. The top of Ritter is not where this fits.

Mike Dunkley asked why there is a mixed use overlay on his property. He wondered if the city was trying to push him out or if it just meant future owners could change the use. Mr. Cooper explained it means no obligation to the current owners.

Mr. Cooper explained the land has been rezoned a few times, most recently in 2021. Landowners have rights to request a review and consideration of land use changes on their property. The previous request in 2021 was for 104 townhomes, this request would be 59. The denied request did not have a traffic analysis and was higher density.

Public Comment – Rezone

Luke Martineau introduced himself and explained the proposed plan. They focus on legacy projects, not cheap housing that won't uplift the area. They have high standards and he offered to provide more details if needed after the presentation.

Melissa Carey said the comparison from the one before and the new one are not apples to apples. Three story units would make a canyon-like feeling with the hill on the other side.

Janet Deschamp said townhomes are not the character of Ritter Drive. That's not a buffer between commercial and residential, it's an eyesore. She felt Mr. Cooper was completely on the developer's side. In her opinion, the GP amendment

Matt White said there are only 30 parking stalls for 59 units. The street would turn into a parking lot. Mr. Cooper clarified that the parking stalls were for visitors, as the units have internal parking. He didn't think it would be a

transition, but a wall. Cherry Creek is around the corner and so that doesn't apply either. This is a direct change, not a transition.

Mike Dunkley doesn't want people to be unable to park in front of his house. He knows more housing is inevitable, but this is too much. This added with the base traffic would be too much traffic. He loves that every house is unique on the street, and that is what the character is on Ritter Drive. They are all unique and the town homes are copy-paste.

Ben Carey asked about the previously approved plan's entrances on Ritter.

Matt White asked if the roundabout would be in before the development. He's still against it.

Janet Deschamp asked for clarification on the traffic study being done. Since it's projected, there is no way to know what the 5600 development is going to do and there are already a lot of near-misses and turnarounds on the street. It will never hold the traffic. It should have been thought about before Ritter was widened and made wider to accommodate.

Joe Gracey wanted to know Mr. Cooper's opinion about how this would affect his property.

Commissioner Francis asked if the 5600 S and 1800 N were considered in the traffic study. Mr. Cooper explained those projects were included in the WFRC's numbers.

Melissa Carey said they would not be affordable housing. They are high-end town homes to get the most money.

The curb in front of the development would be red lined for no parking.

MOTION: Commissioner Henstra moved to close the public hearing.

SECOND: Commissioner Francis

Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Francis:	Yes
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Henstra:	Yes
Commissioner Hilton:	Yes
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent

Motion passed and the public hearing closed at 7:53.

Mr. Cooper addressed the remaining unanswered questions. Height limitation for current zone is 35 feet; the townhomes would be up to 38 feet. He explained that his job is to make objective recommendations and he is not on one side or another. The traffic will be increased; however, the traffic study is to show if the roads can handle the traffic without modifications. Affordability is subjective, the state has defined it in the 400k range. This is not determined by the city. The objective of the moderate-income housing plan is to include different types of housing at different price ranges.

Commissioner Anderson asked Mr. Martineau if the units would eventually be purchased by investors and turned into rentals. Mr. Martineau said an owner-occupied condition could be in the development agreement for a certain number of years. Deed restrictions need to have some flexibility for life events. They should promote owner occupation without putting owners in a bind.

Commissioner Henstra thanked people for attending and said she is a second-generation resident. She understands keeping the old but balancing with the new. The city also must make changes, or the state will mandate them. She wants residents to understand that they are listened to.

Commissioner Bowthorpe has lived 60+ years in Riverdale and he appreciates their opinions. He has been in situations where he has voiced opinions against change.

Commissioner Anderson is also a lifer – he knew the Ritters that Ritter Drive is named for. He values the citizens and their opinions. These decisions are hard but the planning commission has standards and requirements to abide by.

Mr. Cooper reminded commissioners that their decision is only a recommendation and council would have the final decision.

4. Consideration to forward a recommendation to City Council regarding a proposed General Plan amendment which would modify the Riverdale City General Plan as it relates to the Future Land Use Map.

MOTION: Commissioner Francis moved to forward a positive recommendation to City Council regarding a proposed General Plan amendment as requested, based on staff recommendations and the following findings:

- The application has been processed in accordance with Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 20, and the applicable provisions of the Riverdale City Code
- The amendment is consistent with the Housing and Moderate-Income Housing elements of the General Plan
- The amendment constitutes an infill or redevelopment area served by existing public infrastructure, utilities, and transportation facilities. The General Plan identifies such areas as appropriate locations for higher-density residential development.
- The amendment is consistent with the General Plan's transportation and mobility policies, including planned pedestrian and bicycle improvements along Ritter Drive, and supports land use patterns that promote efficient use of transportation infrastructure and multimodal access.
- The amendment supports orderly growth, efficient use of land, and redevelopment within the City's existing urban area, consistent with the long-term land use and infrastructure planning objectives of the General Plan.
- The proposed amendment is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property.
- The proposed amendment will not adversely affect adjacent property or the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.
- The developer/owner is willing to enter into an Agreement for the Development of Land.

SECOND: Commissioner Hilton

Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Francis:	Yes
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Henstra:	Yes
Commissioner Hilton:	Yes
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent

Motion passed with 5 in favor and 1 absent.

5. Consideration to forward a recommendation to City Council for proposed rezone of approximately 4.35 acres, located at 1526 W Ritter Drive, from Single-Family Residential (R-1-8) to Multiple-Family Residential (R-4).

Parking on Ritter and setbacks would be addressed in the site plan process.

MOTION: Commissioner Bowthorpe moved to forward a positive recommendation to city council for the zoning map amendment as requested subject to the information found in the staff report, and based on the following findings:

- The applicant has provided sufficient justification for the proposed amendment
- The proposed amendment is harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property.
- The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, as amended.
- The proposed amendment will not adversely affect adjacent property or the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.
- Facilities and services intended to serve the subject property are adequate, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.
- The developer/owner is willing to enter into an Agreement for the Development of Land.

Commissioner Anderson asked if anything can be specified in the agreement. Mr. Cooper said amendments could be made based on objective standards. In consideration of this, Commissioner Anderson was reluctantly in favor with the development agreement, as it gives the city a say and if this development does not move forward, the zone would revert to the current zone.

SECOND: Commissioner Henstra

Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Francis:	No
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Henstra:	Yes
Commissioner Hilton:	No
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent

Motion carries with 3 in favor, 2 against, 1 absent

6. **Consideration to approve the preliminary Burrows Subdivision, a 2-lot residential subdivision located at 937 West 4400 South, as requested by Bruce Burrows**

MOTION: Commissioner moved to approve the preliminary Burrows Subdivision as requested by Bruce Burrows, based on the findings presented: the application complies with all applicable objective land use regulations of the Riverdale City Code and Utah code title 10 chapter 20, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, and to authorize administrative approval of the final plat upon satisfaction of those conditions.

SECOND: Commissioner Bowthorpe

Commissioner Bowthorpe:	Yes
Commissioner Francis:	Yes
Commissioner Anderson:	Yes
Commissioner Henstra:	Yes
Commissioner Hilton:	Yes
Commissioner Hermann:	Absent

F. Comments

G. Adjournment

As there was no further business to discuss, Commissioner Bowthorpe moved to adjourn. Commissioner Francis seconded the motion. All were in favor and the Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Date Approved: