



## 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, March 2, 2021.

**Commission Members Present:** Jay Bair, Cache Christensen, Jessica Dunyon, Amber Ervin, Jordan Knutson, Sharik Peck

**Staff Present:** Justin Lewis (City Recorder), Terrie Wierenga (City Council), Tucker Thatcher (City Council)

**Others Present:** Debbie Zilles

Chair Jessica Dunyon called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**Approval of the February 2, 2021 meeting minutes.**

Minutes from the February 2, 2021 meeting were reviewed. Cache moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Jay seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Discussion and possible vote on Ordinance 2021-04, an ordinance rezoning Parcel Number 09-066-0010 from A-10 (Agricultural 10-Acre) to A-10 PUD Overlay (Agricultural 10-Acre Planned Unit Development Overlay Zone). The parcel is located at approximately 750 West Main and is 12.51 acres.**

Emails and letters opposing the request were received from Boyd & Wendy Lewis, Nordell Brown, Kip Panter, Brent Christensen, President of Richmond Irrigation & Power Company Board of Directors, Van Skidmore (with a petition signed by several Richmond residents) were received and distributed to the Commission for review before the meeting.

Jess suggested continuing this discussion because the property has not been annexed into the City yet.

Justin noted that the City Council will be considering the annexation request at the March 16, 2021, Council meeting. The annexation process is separate from the rezone request.

**\*\*\* A motion was made by Dunyon to continue Ordinance 2021-04 to the April meeting after an annexation decision is made by the City Council. Amber seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0. \*\*\***

**Yes Vote: Bair, Christensen, Ervin, Knutson, Peck**

**Discussion on Municipal Code Chapter 12-1000 “Overlays”, Section 12-1010-7 “Open Space”.**

Terrie explained that developers have asked about reducing the open space required on PUDs. She has worked on an ordinance with Justin and Jeremy that adjusted it down from 40% to 30%. Other cities range anywhere from 25-50% as a starting point. State code does not mandate a set amount of open space, that is up to individual cities to determine. Guidance came from the General Plan, which was adopted in 2013, with the reasoning that Richmond should keep its rural and open atmosphere. She sent open space informational links out to the Commission to review before the meeting.

Jess asked Jay about his suggestion on removing the multi-family overlay. Jay said his reasoning for his suggestion was based on the need to clarify what would be an acceptable multi-family density. Other cities have density classifications listed in their codes, which would help a developer know what they could plan for. He thinks it should be clearly defined. He used Logan City as a reference example of offering different densities through zoning classifications (MR-20, MR-12, MR-9, etc.).

Justin reviewed the current multi-family overlay on the map.

Jay suggested including some language about what percentage (within the allowed open space) can be used for roads, parking, sidewalks, etc. Developers need information on what can be considered in open space.

Jordan does not feel that the open space percentage needs to be reduced, it may just need more definition. He does not like the idea of including parking, but it could include things such as trails, sidewalks, parks, pavilions. Jay said one of the resources sent out by Jess allowed for 10% of the gross percentage to be parking so this needs to be decided and clearly defined. He explained that there might be possible scenarios for different projects to share some open space (e.g. large parks or specific amenities). Jess cautioned that once something is built, it is almost impossible to ever get it back to open space.

Terrie referenced the current *Municipal Code Section 12-10-10-7 Open Space*:

2. *Total open space must equal 40% of the entire project area.*

3. *A minimum of 10% of the entire project area must be useable open space for recreation.*

She agreed with Jay about the benefit of defining what the formula should be and agreed that the overlays made sense years ago but not as much now; it may be more practical to identify specific areas in the City where zoning should go.

Amber said the obligation that a local government should have in allowing and maintaining the creation of open spaces needs to be clearly defined, especially with what is considered useable.

Jay said there could be more density considered near parks and open areas.

Terrie said it would behoove the City to look closer at inner block development and do some community surveys and studies. This type of development will allow for more affordable housing.

Jay said 60% or more of the work in his profession right now is multi-family housing because that is what is selling and what people can afford.

Justin said the current ordinance will be withdrawn and the Commission will need to let staff know what they would like to see in a new ordinance. He asked them to send either he or Jeremy information on specific verbiage and definitions that they would like to see. Staff will put together another ordinance and it will come back to the Commission for discussion.

Jay suggested creating different density zones like Logan does. Amber noted that Richmond is much different than Logan. Justin said development behind Lee's in Smithfield is zoned at 10 units/acre. Jay said this type of housing/zoning will eventually work its way to Richmond, so it is better to have something in place and be prepared.

Sharik thinks typical townhomes would be the most density he would like to see, he would prefer to keep the open, rural feeling.

Cache said because Richmond is rural and there is a need for personal transportation, one priority he would like to see addressed is the need for parking, road widths, and areas for snow removal. Jay said oftentimes, PUDs take care of their snow removal. Terrie said roads in a PUD or higher-density development, under the current Code, would be public and would have to meet City standards. The only private roads in the City now have been grandfathered in.

Cache questioned whether curb and gutter can be required in a PUD. Justin said they would have to deal with stormwater. Jay would recommend that multi-family developments be required to provide off-street parking to help alleviate parking issues. Justin said these types of issues can often be handled through density bonuses, where certain things can be reduced if other things are done.

**A motion was made by Amber to adjourn at 7:03 p.m. Jordan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

The next meeting will be held Tues. April 13, 2021 at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Debbie Zilles

---

Planning Commission Chairperson