



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 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, July 2, 2019.

Commission Members Present: Jay Bair, Vern Fielding, Rod Going, Jerry Kidd

Commission Members Excused: Jessica Dunyon, Randy Fischer

Staff Present: Justin Lewis, Tucker Thatcher (City Council)

Others Present: Jared Wisner, Marian Fielding, Debbie Zilles

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Rod Going.

Approval of the May 7, 2019 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

Minutes from the May 7, 2019 meeting were reviewed. Jerry moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Jay seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Yes Vote: Bair, Fielding, Going, Kidd

No Vote: None

Absent: Dunyon, Fischer

Discussion and possible vote on the Sign Permit application by Parker Real Estate Services, P.C. for a sign to be located on their building at 9 West Main.

Marian Fielding showed the Commission what is being proposed. The requirement is that it is less than 20% of the area and she questioned what area is considered in the measurement. Rod said it would be the frontage of the building. Marian said the proposal is well within the limits. The proposed sign is approximately 16 feet by 12 feet.

Justin advised that a flat wall sign (which this would be considered as) "*allows the surface area may not be more than two hundred (200) square feet or twenty (20) percent of the building wall surface it is attached to, whichever is less*". [Part 12-702.B (11.b)].

Vern advised that he has a vested interest in this request; however, he would vote.

***** A motion was made by Jay to approve a Sign Permit application by Parker Real Estate Services, P.C. for a sign to be located on their building at 9 West Main. Jerry seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0. *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Fielding, Going, Kidd

No Vote: None

Absent: Dunyon, Fischer

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2019-4, an ordinance modifying and updating Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management”, Chapter 12-300 “Definitions” and Chapter 12-700 “Signs”, Part 12-702 “Types of Signs”, Section D “Sign Designs Not Permitted in Richmond City” and “Sign Reference Chart”.

Justin explained that City Council felt there should be an allowance for temporary signage within the sign ordinance. Although they are not supportive of staked signs which could cause damage to the ground, they determined that temporary A-frame signs, which could be put up and taken down daily, would be appropriate. They directed staff to write up an ordinance.

Jay asked if real estate signs are addressed in the Code. Justin said signs are not allowed in the park strip. Jay asked if the Code should be modified to address these types of signs before approval. Vern said real estate signs are the most common type of signs and having them in the front yards of homes is the most effective. Not allowing them on personal property would set Richmond at odds with other communities in the valley and would be a disservice to the community if homes could not be adequately marketed. He is in favor of allowing them. Justin said this proposal only addresses temporary A-frame signs.

Jerry asked if there had been any complaints and/or concerns with real estate signs. Justin said there has not, the biggest concern of the City Council is temporary type signs (i.e. yard sale) that are attached to poles, fences, etc. Vern asked if the ordinance is all inclusive, or exclusive unless prohibited.

Marian asked about the sign the library uses. Justin said the City is exempt per the code.

This ordinance does not allow signs to be placed in the public right-of-way.

Jerry said he is fine with the way the ordinance is proposed.

***** A motion was made by Vern to approve Ordinance 2019-4, an ordinance modifying and updating Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development & Management”, Chapter 12-300 “Definitions” and Chapter 12-700 “Signs”, Part 12-702 “Types of Signs”, Section D “Sign Designs Not Permitted in Richmond City” and “Sign Reference Chart”. Jay seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0. *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Fielding, Going, Kidd

No Vote: None

Absent: Dunyon, Fischer

Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2019-5, an ordinance modifying and updating Title 12-000 “Land Use, Development and Management”, Chapter 12-000 “Overlays”, Part 12-1020-2 “Standards for Planned Industrial Commercial Developments”.

Tucker explained that there is currently a Planned Industrial Commercial (PIC) overlay; however, the wording is unclear. The current language reads *“12-1020-2 Standards For Planned Industrial Commercial Developments 1. The minimum size for any proposal shall be*

ten (10) acres". The question is whether the 10 acres is to create the PIC or whether any proposed lot within the PIC is required to be 10 acres. Tucker said it seems reasonable to have at least 10 acres to have a PIC approved; however, the lots within the PIC overlay can be smaller. There are a couple of lots in the current PIC that have been subdivided and sold. The desire is to better clarify the way the ordinance is written for clearer understanding. Tucker recommended allowing a minimum of 2-acre lots be allowed within a PIC to allow for smaller projects. The City Attorney recommended cleaning up the language to avoid any misinterpretation.

Rod asked if two acres is small enough. Tucker said one acre was discussed; however, in an industrial setting two acres seemed reasonable.

Jay asked if the area where Julie's Market is proposed, by Cherry Peak Dental, could be a PIC. Tucker explained that this is an overlay for industrial/commercial. Jay said the future Lee's Marketplace may have smaller retail spaces (similar to Smithfield), in which case two acres would be too large. Tucker said a grocery store would not likely be in a PIC area. The initial intention for the overlay is to concentrate industrial uses in one area.

Jared Wisner said the objective is to prevent scattered industrial uses/areas and have them grouped together. A PIC overlay will require 10 acres; however, smaller lots can be established within the overlay. Marian asked if the lots should be allowed smaller than two acres. Vern agreed and pointed out the area around Malouf in Nibley where they have smaller retail spaces (0.5 - 1 acre lots).

Jared pointed out that each lot would still be required to maintain required setbacks, frontage and widths. Possibly the lot sizes could be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Marian pointed out that depending on the type of business, they may be able to share a detention pond and/or parking, which would not require as large of a lot.

Justin suggested adding "the minimum parcel size in the PIC shall be 1 acre".

Jared recommended changing "The minimum size for any ~~proposal~~ shall be ten (10) acres" to "The minimum size or any **new PIC overlay** shall be ten (10) acres".

Vern suggested letting the market dictate the size of individual parcels, if all applicable requirements are met. Tucker understands the reasoning but most things have a minimum requirement.

Jay pointed out that the Commission has some flexibility, for example, within the Highway Commercial (HC) zone the minimum area and width is "*variable, as defined by the Planning and Zoning Commission*" and setbacks have the caveat "*...or otherwise determined by the Planning and Zoning Commission*".

Jared suggested setting a minimum standard and add flexible language.

Vern asked what type of businesses would be in a PIC versus another Commercial or Industrial type of zone. Tucker said many of the uses could crossover and some uses can be approved with a Conditional Use Permit.

Rod asked why the overlay should be limited if it can be dictated and/or approved by the Commission.

***** A motion was made by Vern to approve Ordinance 2019-5, an ordinance modifying and updating Title 12-000 "Land Use, Development and Management", Chapter 12-000 "Overlays", Part 12-1020-2 "Standards for Planned Industrial Commercial Developments". The word "proposal" shall be stricken and replaced with "a PIC overlay", and add "the minimum lot size within such a development to be one (1) acre, unless otherwise approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission". Jerry seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0. *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Fielding, Going, Kidd

No Vote: None

Absent: Dunyon, Fischer

Jay asked about the zoning around future commercial development (Lee's Marketplace) and future annexed areas. He would like to be proactive rather than reactive. Tucker noted that this is addressed within the General Plan.

Future sewer and water connections were discussed.

Justin said this discussion, on the future zoning map, will be added to the next meeting agenda and encouraged members to review the General Plan to come prepared to discuss this issue.

***** Motion to adjourn was made by Vern, seconded by Jay.
Motion approved 4-0 *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Fielding, Going, Kidd

No Vote: None

Absent: Dunyon, Fischer

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 P.M.

Rodney Going, Chairman

Minutes submitted by: Debbie Zilles