

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332
3 October 11, 2017 6:00 p.m.

4
5 **ATTENDANCE**

6 **Chair:** R James, Chairman
7 **Commissioners:** J Parker, R Cecil
8 **Alternates:** R Perry, G Sonntag
9 **Absent:** R Holloway, B Fresz

10
11 **Approval of the Minutes:**

12 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of September 27,
13 2017.

14
15 **Motion to approve the minutes of September 27, 2017 made by R Cecil seconded by G Sonntag.**

16 **Vote**

17 **Yea:** J Parker, R Cecil, R Perry, G Sonntag, R James

18 **Nay:**

19 **Abstained:**

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

- 24
 - No Public Comments

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

27
28 **Action Item(s):**

29 **Item No. 1. Rezone Recommendation:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for recommendation a
30 proposed rezone of Parcel No. 02-096-0011; a 2.86 parcel of property located generally at 100 South 485 West,
31 currently zoned Agricultural (AGR). The applicant is requesting Multi-Family High Density.

- 32
 - S Bankhead reviewed the staff report and reported that ESR (Executive Staff Review) recommended that
33 this parcel be rezoned Multi-Family High density (MFH). ESR felt that because of the revised master plan,
34 and the planned development in the immediate surrounding area that the zone change to MFH would
35 work well in this area.

Staff Report Summary of Key Issues:

1. The General Plan does not presently call for this area to be zoned to multi-family high
2. Property directly across from this parcel has been approved for MFH development

Background Information: Prior to his passing, Kendrick Campbell, through Kent Dunkley, approached the City about rezoning his property from Agricultural to Multi-Family High. Mr. Campbell's family has come to the City since his passing and requested that the rezone continue to move forward.

The property is located on the SE and SW corners of the intersection of 100 South and 485 W. It is directly across the street from where Providence Gateway multi-family project will be constructed.

Although the General Plan does not anticipate the area being rezoned as multi-family high density, ESR reviewed the application and recommends that the Commission forward this on to Council with a recommendation that it be rezoned MFH.

36 **RECOMMENDATION:**

37 That the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the City Council that the General Plan be
38 amended to allow for the rezoning of this property to Multi-Family High (MFH).

39 **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- 40
 1. ES used the Providence City Master Plan 2000 as revised, and also examined current and
41 anticipated development in the immediately surrounding area, to review the application.

42 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1. **CONDITIONS:**

- 1. The rezone is conditional on the property being transferred from the name of Kendrick Campbell into a trust.
- 2. The applicant shall meet all applicable City, state and federal laws, codes, rules.

R James asked if anyone knew how people felt about the proposed zone change.

R Cecil stated that at least 10 families had asked him to vote no on the zone change for this property. They are worried about increased traffic in the area.

G Sonntag discussed that eventually this property zone will be changed from something other than Agricultural, and whatever is put in there will increase the traffic in the area. He also felt that changing the zone to MFH would be a good buffer zone between the commercial area and the church, as well as having another property across the street that is zoned MFH he felt that the proposed zone change and dwellings would fit well in the area.

G Sonntag asked why 100 South is planned to end in a cul-de-sac.

S Bankhead stated that someone that dedicated property for 100 South added a deed restriction so that 100 South could not be made into a through street. She was not sure if the deed restriction would hold up, but she wanted them to be aware that the deed restriction is there. She also noted that when the property was dedicated for the road, the City stated that 100 South became a through street they would reimburse the affected property owners. Kent Dunkley discussed the time when all the landowners dedicated property to the city for 100 south. One of the property owners did not want 100 South to be a through street so he added the deed restriction.

G Sonntag stated that he would be in favor of the zone change, but he would like just the large portion of the parcel, on the east of where the road would be to be zoned MFH, he would like to preserve the smaller portion, on the west side of the road to be kept at the current zone of Agriculture, because one day that property could be zoned commercial some day and he wouldn't want to mess that up by zoning it as MFH.

S Bankhead stated that for the rezone to go forward, the General Plan would have to be amended before the rezone could be approved. The Planning Commission would need to recommend to the City Council to amend the General Plan and then hold a public hearing to amend the General Plan and then they would be able to proceed with the rezone request.

Motion made to schedule a public hearing for this item at the next meeting on October 25, 2017, made by R Cecil, seconded by R Perry.

Vote

Yea: J Parker, R Cecil, R James, R Perry, G Sonntag

Nay: None

Item No. 2. Rezone Recommendation: The Providence Planning Commission will consider for recommendation a proposed rezone of Parcel No. 02-096-0087; a 4.47 parcel of property located generally at 75 South Gateway Drive, currently zoned Mixed-Use (MXD). The applicant is requesting Multi-Family High Density.

- S Bankhead reviewed the findings of fact and recommendation from staff concerning the property. Staff felt that the Planning Commission recommend to the Council that this property not be rezoned to MFH(Multi-Family High) but rather, remain MXD (Mixed Use), and that the developer be required to integrate small-scale commercial into the development. The general plan does not anticipate this property to be rezoned to MFH, so they would recommend that the property be kept MXD, where the developers can still build high-density housing, as long as they also build retail/commercial space as well.

Staff Report Summary of Key Issues:

- 3. The General Plan does not presently call for this area to be zoned to multi-family high
- 4. Property near to this parcel has been approved for MFH development
- 5. This property is located behind the strip of development that includes Maceys and Dollar Tree.

Background Information:

The General Plan does not anticipate the area being rezoned as multi-family high density. There is an opportunity for the developer to incorporate a small amount of retail into the development, which would blend the development in more harmoniously with the development just East of the property.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Commission recommend to the Council that this property not be rezoned to MFH but rather, remain MDU, and that the developer be required to integrate small-scale commercial into the development.

1 **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- 2 2. ES used the Providence City Master Plan 2000 as revised, as well as development in the
3 surrounding area, to review the application.

4 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

5 **CONDITIONS:**

- 6 3. The applicant shall continue to meet all applicable city, state and federal laws, codes, rules.

7 **Motion that Parcel No. 02-096-0087; a 4.47 parcel located at approximately 75 South Gateway Drive, be zoned**
8 **MXD, and recommended against rezoning and changing the General Plan, motion made by R Cecil, seconded by**
9 **R Perry.**

10 **Vote**

11 **Yea: J Parker, R Cecil, R James, R Perry, G Sonntag**

12 **Nay: None**

13
14 **Study Item(s):**

15 **Item No.1 Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
16 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 4 Establishment of Districts by adding Section 6: Life
17 Cycle Residential zone.

18
19 Shari Phippen provided a review of the material provided. She directed the Commission to the design standards for
20 Multi-Family Units, and specifically pointed out the Architectural Design Standards. She added a sentence
21 concerning architectural and material trends, it states, "If the developer feels that the City has not adequately
22 considered a design element or product, the developer may present alternative materials and the City may
23 consider approving those materials."

24 R Cecil brought up something interesting he had heard from several people when he discussed this type of housing
25 with them, he stated that he heard multiple times that people said they would like to see two car garages with the
26 town homes.

27 Shari stated that she was against having two car garages for attached townhomes. She felt that the garages are
28 usually not large enough to fit two cars in them if they are attached to the townhomes. She stated that if the
29 Commission wanted that to be a requirement included in the LCR design standards then they could add that in.
30 S Bankhead brought up that Providence City is looking at its moderate income housing plan, and by stipulating that
31 townhomes have a two-car garage, townhomes may not fit into moderate incoming housing.

32 R Cecil pointed out that people want something that will fit into the neighborhood.

33 Shari pointed out that it would be a good idea to include pictures or graphics of what would be allowed/ desired. It
34 would help the community understand what will be built and will help give developers an idea of what they can
35 build.

36 Shari also had a question for the Commission concerning where they would like the LCR zone to be allowed. Do
37 they want it allowed to be integrated in pre-existing subdivisions, or would they like to see LCR zones be stand-
38 alone zones, or be included in a subdivision with Single Family homes.

39 There was discussion all around concerning the pros and cons of having an LCR zone allowed within established
40 neighborhoods. The Commission was mixed on their opinions. It was discussed in how large of increments would
41 the LCR zone be allowed, 5 acres, 2 acres etc.

42 S Bankhead stated that the Commission needs to decide how serious they are about wanting to integrate multi-
43 family housing. If they are not serious about integrating multi-family housing throughout Providence, then the
44 increments would be higher, such as 5 acres; if they are serious about integrating multi-family throughout the City,
45 then the increments for an LCR zone would need to be smaller.

46 J Drew and J Baldwin discussed the new trend of building tiny houses, and discussed the possibility of including tiny
47 houses into the LCR zone.

48 J Baldwin discussed a similar situation he saw in Boise, to what Providence is currently dealing with. Where the
49 downtown area had large lots, and the city allowed for flag lots to be made and they ended up with four-plexes
50 being built on the flag lots. He felt that the downtown area of Boise really degraded after all those changes were
51 allowed. He agreed with Gary Sonntag that the City will have to be really careful with what they allow in
52 established neighborhoods but if a developer wanted to incorporate some LCR housing into a planned
53 development than they could.

54 Shari discussed an opinion that ESR discussed was having a density range versus a minimum project size, which
55 would help it integrate into established neighborhoods. She also discussed the possibility of having developments

1 that are being planned or phased would have to go off a density range, but subdivisions that were completed
2 before the year 2000 (or any year) would have to comply by a minimum project size. More criteria would be
3 imposed on established areas than undeveloped areas.
4 S Bankhead discussed having multi-family homes as conditional use in a single-family zone. It would not require a
5 rezone.
6 R James clarified S Bankhead's statement, that just the use chart would change and not have an LCR zone or that
7 both would happen.
8 S Bankhead clarified both the use chart and LCR zones would still need to be designed.
9 Shari also asked the Commission their opinion on how many styles of housing they would want included in a
10 development. Currently the proposed code states that no more than 40% of a project can be one type of housing,
11 which would mean that at least three types of housing would need to be in an LCR development.
12 The commission had mixed ideas, of whether or not they would want two or three styles of housing.
13 Someone discussed the idea of including the LCR zone as a buffer zone, between residential and commercial zones.
14

15 **Reports:**

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

- 17 • No Staff Reports

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

- 20 • No Commission Reports

21
22 **Motion to close meeting of October 11, 2017 made by R Cecil, seconded by J Parker.**

23 **Vote**

24 **Yea:** J Parker, R Cecil, R James, R Perry, G Sonntag

25 **Nay:** None

26
27 Prepared by K Soelberg.

28
29 **APPROVED 10/25/2017**

30
31 _____
32 Robert James, Chair

31 _____
32 Skarlet Bankhead