

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Meeting**  
2 **164 N. Gateway Drive, Providence, UT 84332**

3  
4 **June 28, 2017 6:00 p.m.**  
5  
6

7 **Attendance**

---

8 Chair: R James, Chairman  
9 Commissioners: Brent Fresz, John Parker, Ruth Ann Holloway  
10 Excused: None  
11 Absent: None  
12  
13

14 **Approval of the Minutes:**

15 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of June 14, 2017.  
16

17 **Motion made to approve the minutes of June 14, 2017 by J Parker, seconded by R Holloway.**  
18

19 **Vote: Yea: R James, B Fresz, R Holloway, J Parker**  
20 **Nay: None**  
21 **Abstained: None**  
22 **Excused: None**  
23

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

- 27 • Meeting opened for public comments.
- 28 • No public comments made at this time.
- 29 • Public comments session closed.

30 **Note:**

- 31 • Prior to moving on to Action Items, S Bankhead introduced Gary Sonntag. Gary was recently approved to  
32 serve on the Planning Commission. The formal swearing in of Gary Sonntag to the Providence City  
33 Planning Commission proceeded and Gary was welcomed in as the newest member of the Planning  
34 Commission. Gary provided an overview of his work experience and credentials. Gary was the City  
35 Engineer and Public Works Director in Price, Utah. His 32 years of experience include both serving and/or  
36 working with the Planning Commission and City Council in Price, Utah.  
37

38 **Action Item(s):**

39 **Item No. 1. Preliminary Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval the preliminary  
40 plat for Providence Highlands Subdivision Phase 4, a 12-lot residential subdivision, located at approximately  
41 1170 South 400 East. (Discussion time approximately 10 minutes)

42 **Discussion**

- 43 • S Bankhead commented that Brian Lyon from Alliance Consulting Engineers is here to answer questions  
44 on behalf of the developer. S Bankhead then provided an overview of the Executive Staff Review and  
45 conclusion. The preliminary plans were received on April 11, 2017 but the development phase proved to  
46 be a challenge that took a little longer because this is a hillside subdivision. In Phase 4 there are a total of  
47 12 lots and a few of these lots exceeded the 30 percent slope. The road will help mitigate this issue as well  
48 as building envelopes into each of those slopes. City Code Chapters 11-3-3, 10-5, 10-8-1, the Providence  
49 City Corporation Department Standards and Specification Manual and the Master Plan 2000 as revised  
50 were used to review the preliminary plans. The Executive Staff's review concludes that the preliminary  
51 plan meets the requirements of Providence City Code Chapter 11-3-2 with the following conditions. An  
52 easement will need to be recorded and included as part of the final plat for the section of sewer that is off  
53 site. The section extends past the west boundary between Lot 92 and Lot 93. The City Master Plan shows  
54 that the road extends further than what the preliminary plat identifies. The preliminary plan will need to

1 be revised to include and show the full extension of the road within the perimeters of the vicinity  
2 map. On Note G, the preliminary plan identifies that there are no natural waterways, however there is  
3 runoff from the mountain to the east and at this point. The Executive Staff defines natural waterways to  
4 include runoff from the mountains. This will need to be addressed in future phases and may impact this  
5 phase. No further development will be allowed until a secondary access point is established on the south  
6 side which is in compliance to the number of homes the fire code will allow in an area with only a single  
7 point of access. Also noted, Lot 92 will need water service. The Executive Staff concludes that the  
8 preliminary plat meets requirements and recommends that the Planning Commission approve the  
9 preliminary plat for the Providence Highlands Phase 4 Subdivision according to Findings of Facts,  
10 Conclusion of Law, and Conditions identified in that these conditions are fully understood by the  
11 developer.

- 12 • J Parker asked if developer intended to pave the turnaround area.
- 13 • S Bankhead responded that if the turnaround can be maintained with salt, a hard gravel surface will be  
14 allowed. If it cannot be maintained with salt, then an asphalt surface will be required for the turnaround.
- 15 • G Sonntag inquired about the types of improvements that will be implemented to accommodate the  
16 drainage from the hillside.
- 17 • S Bankhead response was that the developer will be given the opportunity to address this in the  
18 construction plans.
- 19 • R Holloway asked for further clarification on the percent of grade on the road because the fire marshal  
20 stipulates no more than a 10 percent slope.
- 21 • Brian Lyon, Alliance, responded that the development will follow the cross grades and the road has less  
22 than a 10 percent slope; it is within a 3 to 4 percent slope range.
- 23 • R James commented on Note G in reference to the natural waterways asking that this condition be  
24 further clarified and possibly revised to state specifically that the developer will need to determine if the  
25 runoff drainage will affect that development phase and if so how it will be mitigated.
- 26 • Brian Lyon, Alliance Consultant Engineers, addressed additional questions regarding easements stating he  
27 is currently evaluating if an easement already exists and if it does not, he will apply for one. For the  
28 turnaround located in Millville, a temporary easement will be provided to Providence City to allow  
29 snowplowing of the road and this will be identified and included on the final plat.
- 30 • J Parker asked how water will be moved to the retention pond.
- 31 • Brian Lyon responded that there are catch basins along the road so water will flow from the catch basins  
32 into drainage pipes that go to the retention pond.
- 33 • R James concluded that if there were no further questions, the Commission can consider a motion.

34  
35 **Motion made to approve the Phase 4 Preliminary Plat Providence Highland Subdivision with conditions as**  
36 **stated. - by J Parker, seconded by B. Fresz.**

37  
38 **Vote:**

39 **Yea: B Fresz, R Holloway, R James, J Parker, Gary Sonntag**

40 **Nay: None**

41 **Abstained: None**

42 **Excused: None**

43  
44 **Study Item(s):**

45 **Item No. 1. Discussion:** Danny Macfarlane will discuss a proposed rezone from Single-Family Traditional (SFT) to  
46 Multi-Family High (MFH) for Parcel No. 02-093-0028, a 2.03 acre parcel located at 196 West 100 North. (Discussion  
47 time approximately 15 minutes)

48 Discussion

- 49 • R James opened discussion on item No. 1, a proposed rezone from SFT to MFH for Parcel No 02-093-0028  
50 located at 196 West 100 North.
- 51 • Keni Althouse, a landscape architect with Civil Solutions representing concerns addressed of too many  
52 uses for the parcel. This also changed the number of units being built. The original proposal was 16 units  
53 per acre, with this new single use zone, it will be 14 units per acre and there are 28 units in total on the  
54 parcel. To address concerns from adjacent property owners on the south and east side that front doors

1 were too close to their property line, the new concept would push the units back 40 to 50 feet from the  
2 property lines. This allows a considerable landscape buffer. Another concern mentioned was a lack of  
3 open space especially for families with young children. The new concept provides considerable open  
4 space with front doors opening onto the green space that families can utilize. The next item of concern  
5 was guest parking. The new concept has 14 guest parking stalls. The current building footprint also has  
6 two-car garage stalls. An approval of a MFH zoning this also helps with the City's 2020 plan to have 77  
7 more units of 50 to 80 percent AMI within the City. In addition, these units will be priced between  
8 \$190,000 and \$200,000 which places them into the affordable housing category.

- 9 • J Parker commented that for 28 units there is only one dumpster.
- 10 • Keni Althouse responded that the dumpster measures 28 by 10 feet and will hold two dumpsters.
- 11 • R James commented that he wanted to emphasize that this is a rezone and the focus should be on  
12 rezoning and not on the site plans. The site plans and concept plans at this point can change significantly.
- 13 • S Bankhead discussed the usage chart and the type of development allowed in a multi-family high-density  
14 district. Also discussed were changes in legislature affecting home business licensing requirements.
- 15 • R Holloway also commented on these legislature changes identifying that the purpose for the change was  
16 to encourage home businesses that will help provide citizens in Utah the opportunity of achieving greater  
17 financial independence.
- 18 • R James encouraged further review of Providence City Code 10-4, that addresses the establishment of  
19 districts, and Chapter 10-6 that addresses permitted usages.
- 20 • R Holloway commented that an additional concern she had about rezoning this area is the impact that the  
21 increase in traffic will have in combination with an increase in the number of school age children in that  
22 area. This raises various safety concern because 1<sup>st</sup> North is already a very busy roadway and 2nd West is  
23 near a park.
- 24 • J Drew, City Council Member, commented that the master transportation plan is showing a roundabout  
25 planned for that area that may help mitigate traffic flow.
- 26 • Megan Young, resident of Providence, questions whether a roundabout would be a good solution. She  
27 questions why the area should be rezoned at all if there is no real need for the rezone.
- 28 • Future planning currently being considered for incorporation into the City's Master Plan were reviewed  
29 and discussed. The impact of which may also contribute to improving traffic flow in the area.
- 30 • Bryan Carlson, resident of Providence, commented that multi-family makes sense but high density does  
31 not and suggested neighbors to look at and review. He identified Wilshire (high density), Blackhawk and  
32 several other neighborhoods as good examples of how multi-family housing does or does not work in  
33 neighborhoods.
- 34 • Megan Young, resident of Providence, referenced a study completed by Professor Jorgenson at the  
35 University of Idaho on multi-family and mixed-use zoning. She will forward the study to the Planning  
36 Commission.
- 37 • Alese Crocket, resident of Providence, asked about the population in low-density housing and whether  
38 townhomes could be built in a multi-family zoning district.
- 39 • S Bankhead responded that it would be 7.5 units and provide additional information on various density  
40 level options available for both multi-family and single-family housing.
- 41 • R James stressed that a public hearing will be held on any further development proposals. The developer  
42 at this point is determining if the concept plan is feasible at this point and whether there is a possibility of  
43 moving forward with it.
- 44 • Discussion session closed.

45  
46 **Item No. 2. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss possible changes to Providence  
47 City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations Chapter 8 Area Regulations regarding the height of front yard fences.  
48 (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes)

- 49  
50 • R James opened the discussion. Additional Information from Millville, Hyrum, Smithfield and North Logan  
51 was collected and reviewed regarding fence installation guidelines and standards.

- 1 • S Bankhead reviewed the concerns of installing a six-foot fence in the front yard. Game fences as high as 8  
2 feet are allowed in the backyard, but in general, the standard height for a front yard fences in most cities  
3 is 4 feet. This request came from a resident that is on a large lot to address problems with wildlife and to  
4 stop people from parking on the property. A formal request has not been submitted. A formal request  
5 would be required to evaluate whether the request necessitates a change in ordinance.  
6 • R Holloway commented that although she understands the resident's dilemma, she felt there are other  
7 better solutions to resolve the issue. She would not approve a wide-sweep on an ordinance change.  
8 • B Fresz commented on the both pros and cons. His main concerns were visibility issues that could create  
9 safety concerns. In contrast, if a higher fence provides enough transparency, he sees no reason to not  
10 allow higher fences.  
11 • G Sonntag discussed various aspects of how changing the ordinances can impact the aesthetics of  
12 neighborhoods. He did not suggest a change of ordinance based on a few requests; the entire area needs  
13 to be taken into consideration. A standard is already established and in place.  
14 • Discussion closed.

15 **Report**

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

- 17 • S Bankhead provided a brief progress report on the General Plan Update. CRSA commented on being very  
18 optimistic about the input received to date and will be providing a formal report summary that they  
19 would like to present in the third week of July. Noted in particularly were the numerous comments about  
20 having more hiking trails.  
21 • Several developers have approached the City about areas that are currently outside future annexation  
22 plans and this is a topic that needs to be addressed. A joint staff workshop that would include the  
23 Planning Commission, City Council and Executive Staff will be scheduled. It will be a public meeting.  
24

25 **Commission Reports:** Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no  
26 formal action will be taken.  
27

28 **Motion to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting of June 28, 2017 made by J Parker, seconded by G**  
29 **Sonntag.**

30  
31 **Vote:**

32 **Yea: R James, B Fresz, R Holloway, J Parker, G Sonntag**  
33 **Nay: None**  
34 **Abstained: None**  
35 **Excused: None**  
36

37 Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

38  
39 Minutes prepared by K Merrill.  
40

41  
42 **Approved 08/09/2017**

43  
44 \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Robert James, Chairman  
46

43  
44 \_\_\_\_\_  
45 Kristine Merrill, Office Specialist  
46