

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Agenda**
2 **Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332**
3 **March 14, 2018 6:00 p.m.**

4
5 **Call to Order:** Robert James, Chair

6 **Attendance:** Rowan Cecil, Brent Fresz, Ruth Ann Holloway, Robert James, John Parker

7 Alternates: Robert Perry, Gary Sonntag

8
9 **Approval of the Minutes:**

10 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for February 28, 2018.

11 Corrections:

- 12 • Page 3 line 2 change Utah Department of Water Quality to State Department of Environmental Quality

13 **Motion to accept the minutes of February 28, 2018 with proposed changes – R Cecil, second – J Parker**

14 **Vote:**

15 **Yea: R Cecil, B Fresz, R Holloway, J Parker**

16 **Nay: None**

17 **Abstained: R Perry, R James**

18 **Excused: None**

19
20 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the Planning Commission to express their views on issues within
21 the City's jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Commission. Remarks are limited to 3 minutes per
22 person. The total time allotted to public comment is 15 minutes.

23
24 No Public Comments

25
26 **Public Hearing(s):** None

27 The Planning Commission requested a public hearing for their next meeting on March 28, 2018 for Code
28 Amendment City Code Title 11 Subdivision Regulations Chapter 4 Design Standards Section 3: Street
29 Improvements.

30
31 **Action Item(s):** None

32
33 **Study Items(s):**

34 **Item No. 1. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
35 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 4 Establishment of Districts by adding Section 6: Life
36 Cycle Residential zone. (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes.)

- 37 • S Phippen explained she added the definitions on housing.
- 38 • The percentage of a common wall is to prevent someone from connecting two single-family units with a
39 breezeway and try to call it a duplex. R Holloway asked about insurance with a breezeway. G Sonntag
40 explained the building code addresses fire separation.
- 41 • The Commission felt the definitions should be in City Code Title 10 Chapter 1
- 42 • There was a question concerning the definition of Single Family Attached and Duplex, are the dwellings on
43 separate lots or one lot with two dwellings. It was decided that because these definitions are already in
44 the City Code and would be emitted that no resolution was needed because the answer is already laid out
45 clearly in the definition section of city code.
- 46 • A condominium is included as a single family attached dwelling.
- 47 • Section 6: Change "unit" to "dwelling"
- 48 • B Fresz asked if 750 square feet for a minimum for apartments is too large as a minimum. It was decided
49 to keep it at 750 minimum.
- 50 • R James added that a "1" needed to be added to minimum density as a note.
- 51 • B Fresz asked if they'd like to change the minimum lot width for an apartment to 16 feet minimum, 20
52 feet average like single family attached. He didn't understand why an apartment needed to be wider than
53 a townhome. S Phippen stated that she would review everything about apartments and make some
54 changes.

- 1 • S Phippen discussed the changes made to setbacks for single family attached dwellings and apartments. As
- 2 well as where the 10 feet of landscaping on each side of the building begins.
- 3 • The 10 foot of landscaping requirement between buildings was discussed. If two buildings are
- 4 perpendicular to each other does each building need to have 10 feet of required landscaping or is it a
- 5 total of 10 feet between the buildings. It was noted that they need to determine what the landscaping is
- 6 for, open-space, utilities, transportation (sidewalks) etc. S Bankhead suggested if the Commission allows
- 7 sidewalk as part of the landscaping that the sidewalk be limited to a certain amount of feet. G Sonntag
- 8 recommended picking a reference point such as the property line to reference for the 10 feet minimum of
- 9 landscaping.
- 10 • It was discussed whether there should be a minimum project size in the ordinance. It was also discussed
- 11 whether the Life Cycle Zone is intended for infill or not. There were mixed thoughts on having a minimum
- 12 project size. B Fresz hesitated to have a minimum project size, but also threw out 2 acres as a suggestion.
- 13 R James did some calculations and found that it would be possible to have mixed density homes on 2
- 14 acres. S Bankhead suggested that if there is some intention to have some revitalization by implementing
- 15 the LCR zone than 2 acres could be a good minimum project size.
- 16 • It was decided to add a statement concerning a minimum project size of 2 acres and keep the 50%
- 17 maximum of one type of density housing.
- 18 • R James asked if they wanted to require Single Family Detached in every LCR zone. That would help
- 19 mitigate the concern of having only medium to high density housing.
- 20 • It was decided to add a statement requiring Single Family detached dwelling units in every LCR zone.
- 21 Percentages were discussed, they felt 20% would be sufficient.
- 22 • It was clarified that the maximum amount of dwelling units is 12 units per acre. Meaning on one acre you
- 23 could have 12 apartments, not 12 apartment buildings.
- 24 • S Phippen provided a summary of the plan for phasing within the LCR zone. She felt the best way to go
- 25 about phasing is to require a Master Development Agreement to be recorded against the land when the
- 26 preliminary plat is recorded.
- 27 • Concerns about developers not finishing projects and only building multi-family units were expressed. S
- 28 Bankhead read from the current city code concerning phasing and suggested adding a statement that
- 29 exempts the housing percentage from phasing, but no more than 2 phases may be completed without
- 30 incorporating all 3 housing types. The Commission members agreed with that statement and asked that
- 31 the wording from the City Code be incorporated into the LCR zone code with the exception S Bankhead
- 32 proposed. The code S Bankhead referenced was 11-3-2b-4.
- 33 • R James asked if the Commission wanted to have another public hearing. It was decided that they do want
- 34 to have another public hearing to get input from the public.

35
 36 **Item No. 2. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
 37 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations and Parking Requirements by adding
 38 Section 9 Design Standards for Residential Development. (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes)

- 39 • Item was tabled until the next meeting. S Phippen reported that the City Attorney had no comments
- 40 concerning the design standards.

41
 42 **Item No. 3. General Plan:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss a draft of the general plan, prepared
 43 by CRSA. (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes)

- 44 • B Fresz reported that the Commission asked City Staff to work on some strategies for the general plan. He
- 45 felt that the information he got back were comments about the strategies, not strategies. S Bankhead
- 46 reported that most of the strategies need to be thrown out. City staff felt that there was a lot of
- 47 redundancy within the strategies. S Bankhead asked the Commission if they really want multi-modal
- 48 transportation. If the City decides they really want multi-modal transportation they need to envision how
- 49 the streets will actually look, because although it works mathematically it's not function if you allow
- 50 parking. Functionality is the biggest concern when it comes to multi-modal transportation.
- 51 • R James suggested that like cars, bikers need some paths to get to the main throughway. Not every street
- 52 needs to have bike lanes, he suggested looking at the transportation plan to find some streets that would
- 53 work to incorporate bike lanes on. It was discussed that people envisioned bike lanes on the main

1 corridors, not on all streets. The Canyon Road bike lane was discussed that there could be a strategy to
2 have bike lanes going up and down.
3

4 **Reports:**

5 Staff Reports: Any items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as informational only.

6 Commission Reports: Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no
7 formal action will be taken.

- 8 • Schedule public hearing on 11-4
9

10 **Motion to adjourn – R Cecil, second – J Parker**

11 **Vote:**

12 **Yea: R Cecil, B Fresz, R Holloway, J Parker**

13 **Nay: None**
14

15 Minutes prepared by Katie Soelberg.

16 **Minutes APPROVED – March 28, 2018**
17
18

19 _____
20 Robert James, Chair

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder