



RICHMOND CITY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

City Council Chambers
6 West Main Street
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, September 4, 2018.

Commission Members Present: Jay Bair, Jessica Dunyon, Vern Fielding, Randy Fisher, Rod Going, Jerry Kidd

Staff Present: Jeremy Kimpton (City Administrator), Tucker Thatcher (Councilmember)

Others Present: Amy Jensen, Donna Carlson, Debbie Zilles

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

Approval of the August 7, 2018 Planning Commission meeting minutes.

Minutes from the August 7, 2018 meeting were reviewed. Jerry moved that the minutes be approved as submitted. Vern seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Yes Vote: Bair, Dunyon, Fielding, Fisher, Going, Kidd

No Vote: None

Discussion and possible vote on a rezone request by Amy Jensen to rezone Parcel Number 09-049-0038, 2.00 acres, from RE-2 (Residential 2-Acre) to RE-1 (Residential 1-Acre) located at 192 North 300 East.

Amy explained that the request is to change two acres from RE-2 to RE-1 to sell the land and build a single-family home. She believes the one-acre lot is in line with the Master Plan and helps maintain the rural feel of the area. The family who will purchase the land and build the home have lived in Richmond for many years. She has a letter of support from her neighbor to the south, Richard Carlson. His wife Donna was in attendance.

Jeremy confirmed for Jessica that there is enough frontage to meet the required setbacks, although it may be tight on the south side. Tucker advised that side setbacks in RE-1 are 50 feet and 20 feet. Jeremy said there is approximately 60 feet on the north side and 23 feet on the south so it will be right up against the setback. Tucker recommended that Amy have a survey completed prior to the City Council meeting.

***** A motion was made by Jessica to approve the rezone request by Amy Jensen to rezone Parcel Number 09-049-0038, 2.00 acres, from RE-2 (Residential 2-Acre) to RE-1 (Residential 1-Acre). The parcel is located at 192 North 300 East. The motion was seconded by Randy. The vote was unanimous. *****

Yes Vote: Bair, Dunyon, Fielding, Fisher, Going, Kidd

No Vote: None

General Plan Discussion

Review and discussion of Land Use: Residential Goals, Objectives, and Action/Policies outlined in the General Plan (page 26-27)

LAND USE: RESIDENTIAL GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIONS/POLICIES		
Goal 1: Strive to achieve responsible and well-managed growth within the City.		
Objective: Allow development to occur on parcels of land most suitable for and capable of supporting the kind of development being proposed.		
Action/Policy	Timing	Agency
Action/Policy A: Channel development into areas where existing infrastructure is already in place or planned in the near future.	Review as Needed	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy B: Permit development only to the degree the City has capacity to provide the necessary municipal services.	Review as Needed	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy C: Ensure development provides adequate on-site and off-site improvements necessary to support the development and mitigate its effects on or beyond the immediate site.	Review as Needed	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy D: Update the City Zoning Ordinance so that it identifies requirements inner-block infill development.	0-1 year	Staff/Planning/City Council
Goal 2: Improve the development review process to ensure all development related applications submitted to the City comply with all adopted ordinances, rules, policies, and procedures.		
Objective: Maintain and improve the planning expertise needed to review development plans to ensure accurate interpretation of the City's ordinances and plans.		
Action/Policy	Timing	Agency
Action/Policy A: Periodically evaluate development review process to ensure it is adequate as a mechanism in evaluating site development and other plans.	Review Every 5 years	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy B: Maintain competent professionals and citizen planners in the community and offer ongoing educational and other opportunities for improving and maintaining best-possibilities-planning capability of all those involved in the City's planning process.	Education for citizen planners every 3 to 5 years	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy C: Evaluate the need for a part-time or consultant City Planner to handle large or difficult development requirements of the community.	Continually	Mayor/ City Council

Jay asked about a comment last meeting that indicated growth had exceeded the 2020 census. Jeremy did not have the actual population numbers, but estimated it about 2,700. Jay said in his neighborhood, there are still another four phases that could be developed, which would essentially double the size of the area.

Jerry asked about the timing of the goals and whether any had been met. Tucker said the General Plan was adopted in 2013.

Vern asked if there was a plan for systematic education and/or what training resources are available for meeting Goal 2, Action Policy B. Rod said the Utah League of Cities & Towns (ULCT) holds an annual conference with one day focused on land-use training and asked if there was money in the budget for members to attend. Jeremy said he will look into that. Tucker advised that when he moved from the Planning Commission to the City Council, Cache County Planning provided training, which could be considered again. Rod recommended combined training with the City Council. Tucker noted that there are webinars available and occasionally Utah State University has training. Vern encouraged the Commission to review Municipal Code Title 12 Section 400 which outlines the establishment and procedural matters related to the Commission.

Jessica said Objective 1: Action/Policy D “Update the City Zoning Ordinance so that it identifies requirements for inner-block infill development” seems to require action. Tucker agreed and noted that there have been updates made to clean up zoning requirements for a five acre minimum so that a smaller piece of land can be rezoned to match the surrounding zone. Tucker recommended discussion about the possibility of options, such as flag lots, to help with middle block development. Currently flag lots are not allowed. Rod agreed and noted that the lot behind his home has 6 feet high grass, which is a fire hazard. Homeowners need to maintain their property. Tucker said any ideas or simplification of inner-block development can be forwarded to the City Council for review.

Jay said the idea of flag lots seems to be economically feasible as there are utilities and infrastructure already in place, which can create more affordable housing options and preserve existing farm land.

Goal 3: Further protect the Sensitive Lands by identifying the areas within the community that would require development to be limited because of slope, flooding, geologic, or other issues.

Objective: Determine areas that should be considered for limited development because of issues that would jeopardize the public health, safety, welfare and environment of Richmond City.

Action/Policy	Timing	Agency
Action/Policy A: Establish criteria to serve as a guide in determining areas of “No Build” due to natural hazards, i.e. flood lands, steep slopes, wet lands, streams, etc.	0-1 year	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy B: Require within the Zoning Ordinance that all jurisdictional wetlands be identified on each development plan proposal and that these areas be avoided.	0-1 years	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy C: Require within the Zoning Ordinance language that will not allow modifications of natural drainage channels due to development and that all channel crossings include oversized culverts. The Code requirements should also <u>disallow</u> development to occur within 100 feet of drainage channels or in historical flooding areas within the City that are not currently designated.	0-1 year	Staff/Planning/City Council

Goal 4: Establish guidelines and areas for life-cycle housing opportunities

Objective: Determine areas that will be best suited for development of life-cycle housing that will not take away from the character and values of the community but will allow Richmond to have a place for seniors and young couples to live that fits their changing needs.

Action/Policy	Timing	Agency
Action/Policy A: Develop a zone that allows for mixed-use housing and commercial/professional /retail opportunities	0-2 years	Staff/Planning/City Council
Action/Policy B: Update ordinances that give guidance for mixed-use zoning that include landscape requirements, parking, and open space guidelines.	0-2 years	Staff/Planning/City Council

(In reference to Goal 4) Vern said the demographics are changing as the population ages and large lots become more unmanageable, which creates an opportunity to provide for different types of housing needs. Active adult communities (55 and older) would be ideal for inner-block development. Rod agreed and said it could also lend itself to senior centers. Jessica pointed out that there is a definite difference between an active adult community and rental units.

Tucker said currently an inner-block development would have to have an official City street that connects to an existing street (specifics can be found in Title 12 Chapter 5 for Land Use, Development and Management). Tucker supports reviewing the policy and coming up with ideas and options for more flexibility. The Master Plan encourages preservation of agricultural land and this idea fits with that by would utilize existing infrastructure.

Vern pointed out the challenge for walkability in Richmond, as commercial grows and amenities increase, this type of development will become more feasible.

Jeremy said they are working on development agreement templates, streamlining the application process, making it more accurate and user-friendly, and creating a department checklist. Jay asked about the City accepting digital plans. Jeremy said they are considering that, one of the difficulties is not having the ability to print out larger-scale plans at the city office, if necessary.

Vern asked about concerns/issues from residents that the Commission should be aware of. Jeremy said questions related to inner-block projects and more flexibility for development options are quite common.

Jay said the Master Plan outlines Goal 3 well. There are natural wash areas to the north (referenced the FEMA Flood Plan Map); however, there may be some concern as future property is annexed and developed. Rod pointed out that the Code disallows development to occur within 100 feet of drainage channels or in the historical flooding areas within the City that are not currently designated. Tucker said Cache County was not concerned about maintaining the drainage of the canals. The City has discussed burying a culvert. Jay said the canal handled most of the runoff in the past; however, now that it has been piped there could be some future concerns.

Randy said there is a need for higher-density areas. Jessica suggested a strategic and proactive approach in reviewing areas where this type of housing would best fit. Jay agreed future development areas should be considered. Jerry said future commercial will most likely be along the highway. Randy said the challenge is whether the City can direct/drive development to specific areas. High-density zones increase the value of property. Jay said there should be a consensus of where this type of development would be acceptable. Randy said infrastructure costs are the developer's concern. Jay agreed, but noted that once it is developed, it becomes the City's responsibility to maintain. Richmond needs to be smart about preserving agricultural land.

Jay asked if the City gets much revenue from the Cherry Peak Ski Resort. Jeremy said Cache County has jurisdiction. Jay advised that the traffic that comes through puts wear and tear on City roads. Vern asked about annexing the resort to recoup some revenue. Tucker said it has not been discussed. Tucker noted that the road would have to come up to City standards and be maintained, which would be a huge undertaking.

Jay suggested looking at areas that might be conducive for high-density, mixed-use and affordable housing. Jessica does not support high-density housing in Richmond, she believes it should remain low-medium density and agricultural. Randy said Richmond is a bedroom community because land was historically more affordable years ago when it was further away from amenities. Vern noted it does not need to be high-density, there is room to move in that direction. Rod said even though the City meets the current affordable housing requirement, there is a need to plan proportionally for the future.

Vern suggested discussing sections/topics each meeting. Vern asked that the Commission be provided with a bullet list of topics which have been reviewed and any relevant information forwarded from the City Council.

Jay asked if zoning could drive development in specific areas. Tucker said another zone could be created; however, ultimately it is the property owner who would have to request a rezone. Jay suggested considering zones that could be created to allow for possible future options.

Randy reiterated the concern about more training. Jessica agreed and advised that each member has a different personal skill set and opinions. Jay suggested taking time each meeting to review the Plan to ensure better overall understanding. Jeremy agreed that discussion at each meeting is a good format.

Jeremy said that the City will find funds to provide training. Members are invited to attend the ULCT Fall Conference in Salt Lake City in September of each year.

***A motion to adjourn was made by Randy and seconded by Vern. The vote was unanimous. ***

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

Rodney Going, Chairman

Minutes submitted by: Debbie Zilles