

- 1 • J Bradshaw expressed that it would come in different phases. He would like to come back with a master
2 plan on the entire property (136 acres) with the phasing in place and traffic studies included. He believes it
3 makes more sense to master plan the whole development at once. He also would like a proposal created that
4 would benefit both sides. The density of an SFL zone requires half-acre lots. The property for roads is
5 approximately 15-20 percent of the land. The majority of the density will be put in certain spots to preserve
6 open space. He is very much interested in keeping open space trails. He stated, "We want to create a
7 development that will make money as well as be a credit to the City. Providence has a different kind of
8 mindset compared to other communities. We know if it is to get approved, it must make sense with the
9 community." He explained that he cannot give figures on density until he can get the development designed
10 and approved.
- 11 • J Russell asked if he has other developments in Cache Valley.
- 12 • J Bradshaw indicated that he has no other developments in Cache Valley; they are more in the Salt Lake
13 City area.
- 14 • B Bagley noted that the first access would be 300 North, the second access on Center Street, and the third
15 one on 200 North. He asked for clarification on where the roads will be. He asked if JoAnn Thompson
16 would have traffic coming from 200 North and 300 North past her corner. Even though there will be three
17 accesses, two will be coming down 200 North. One access will be by Rinderknechts, and one by Baer's.
- 18 • J Bradshaw said he is correct, and that is the way it is shown on the Master Plan.
- 19 • H Ames wondered why the Master Plan shows the area as being zoned SFT.
- 20 • S Bankhead explained that it was zoned that way because a previous commission felt it would be the most
21 desirable goal for the area. Since then, this Commission developed an SFL zone in the residential area that
22 was added to the General Plan. At one time, people felt it would be desirable to have 12,000 sq. ft. lots, and
23 now the option is available to have 20,000 sq. ft. lots. The Commission previously entertained the adjacent
24 property that is now zoned as SFL.
- 25 • B Bagley stressed that the Planning Commission denied the rezone. Deon Johnson asked for
26 reconsideration by the City Council, and they rezoned it as SFL.
- 27 • J Bradshaw explained that the Planning Commission didn't have the option to zone it as SFL. The City
28 Council adopted the SFL zone and then adopted the piece of property as SFL.
- 29 • S Bankhead said there was a timing issue in the way the SFL ordinance was adopted. The Commission
30 recommended adopting the ordinance. It came to the City Council the week after the Planning Commission
31 looked at the Anderson Development's request for SFT. At that point in time, they could not ask for SFL.
32 The Council first denied the recommendation as SFT, but after the ordinance was passed, D Johnson asked
33 that it be considered with the SFL zone in place. They then motioned to change the zone to SFL.
- 34 • H Ames expressed that the Planning Commission did not want the rezone to take place.
- 35 • B Bagley asked why it did not come back to the Planning Commission as a request to be rezoned to SFL.
- 36 • S Bankhead felt this is a legal question.
- 37 • S Wyatt said it doesn't matter how it was revised. The City Council has the right to do what they want. The
38 Planning Commission recommended against SFT and the City Council upheld that decision. They wanted
39 to see the land brought in as an SFL zone, so they granted it.
- 40 • H Ames emphasized that it bypassed many processes.
- 41 • B Bagley felt all zoning requests must go through the Planning Commission. He believes that since the
42 Planning Commission denied the request, it should have been reapplied for.
- 43 • S Wyatt informed the Commission that the City Council has the authority to accept or reject the
44 Commission's recommendation.
- 45 • J Russell stated that the Planning Commission recommended denial, and the City Council has the right to
46 approve it. Since this is an entirely different request, he asked why it didn't come back to the Planning
47 Commission.
- 48 • S Wyatt recommended they ask the City Council.
- 49 • J Bradshaw stressed that his development asked for the SFT zone. He believes it is unfair to say the
50 Planning Commission denied it because it characterizes the vote on SFT. Several members of the Planning
51 Commission were clear that if given the option for SFL, they would have voted for it. The City Council
52 took it into consideration. They denied the request for SFT designation, but based upon the application,

1 rezoned it to SFL. They were not ignoring or overruling the Planning Commission, but were recognizing
2 what had been suggested by the Planning Commission.

3 • S Wyatt explained that the Planning Commission makes recommendations on land use ordinances. They
4 are the body that was created to look at land use ordinances and rezoning. Once an ordinance is presented
5 or a proposed change goes through the Planning Commission, the City Council has the right to amend it. If
6 it is a land use issue, the Planning Commission makes the recommendation; if the City Council wants to see
7 it in an amended form, they have the right to pass it. The same is true in a rezone. S Wyatt said, "If you
8 want it to be clear and don't want it rezoned to anything, it must be in the motion." He said it is a political
9 decision as to whether the City Council should or shouldn't have the right to change the rezone.

10 • L Campbell asked why it came as SFT instead of SFL.

11 • J Bradshaw commented that his company would like to see it zoned as SFT, but will go with the SFL zone.
12 The bordering land is zoned SFT, and it makes the most sense to zone this piece the same. The property to
13 the east is SFL.

14 • B Bagley explained that the Master Plan is being revised. The Planning Commission has the prerogative to
15 look at the Master Plan.

16 • J Bradshaw informed the Commission that J Russell wasn't here when the process was gone through. The
17 City Council, when annexing the property, went through the road design. The City Council did not want all
18 of the cars from the larger subdivision coming down 300 North since the road was smaller, and they told J
19 Bradshaw he must come up with another access for other phases.

20 • B Bagley doesn't believe 200 North and 300 North can handle the increased traffic.

21 • J Bradshaw explained that it will be looked into.

22 • H Ames emphasized that the Commission has had many discussions on how bringing the development in as
23 one lump is not the right way to do it because of infrastructure. Until everything is in place, they could be
24 way off in traffic studies and models. The recommended zoning process is to develop small chunks to see
25 what the actual impacts are. When huge pieces are developed and they are off-track, it puts a burden on
26 everyone.

27 • J Bradshaw said his company is interested in the Planning Commission's input and would be more than
28 happy to design it in phases. They will be flexible, but from a developer's standpoint, they cannot plan or
29 phase until a zone is in place.

30 • H Ames told him he could begin working the other land that is zoned as SFT and SFL.

31 • J Bradshaw felt this piece of land is an integral part of the development.

32 • H Ames felt it doesn't make sense to rezone the land at this time. He feels this rezone is ahead of the game
33 because all issues are involved with the large parcel of property.

34 • J Bradshaw expressed that this rezone is needed in order to proceed with their goal as part of the
35 transportation corridor. Providence has a big problem with Center Street, and another road would reduce
36 traffic.

37 • B Bagley felt the problem was created because of poor planning years ago. He doesn't want to be in the
38 same mix with 300 North.

39 • J Bradshaw said when he looks for a rezone, he looks at the City's General Plan. He then asks for a zone
40 that will work. He feels the SFT zone will work for this piece. If the Commission and Council feel an SFL
41 zone is better, he will use that zone.

42 • B Bagley is concerned that an off-set intersection will be made that will go into Don Jenkins's home.

43 • J Bradshaw is confident that they can come up with an idea for something other than an off-set intersection.
44 He expressed that nothing can be built until the Planning Commission approves the plan for the road.

45 • Amy Croft feels it is not a viable traffic option to use 400 East and 200 North to 300 North as a way out of
46 the development because the roads are not safe. Driveways in that area are very steep, and she doesn't feel
47 a road there would be viable.

48 • Sharell Eames is pursuing what she considers the inappropriateness of the reconsideration the City Council
49 gave to this piece of property. She doesn't believe D Johnson mentioned the change from SFT to SFL when
50 he asked for reconsideration. She feels the reason he gave was because of something inappropriate during
51 the meeting where it was recommended for denial, and she believes his reasoning was entirely false.

- 1 • H Ames asked if he could get a rough draft of the transportation overlay plan explaining access and egress
2 because it involves this specific parcel. He also felt that more outlets should be made.
- 3 • J Bradshaw explained that three accesses were to come off the bench; 200 North and 300 North (which will
4 go to Spring Creek Parkway), and Center Street.
- 5 • J Russell said this plan is not set. The County is looking at what Providence would like to do with the roads.
- 6 • H Ames felt it would be important to draft a real transportation overlay off the bench. He prefers to not wait
7 until it is set that the developer will make an offset intersection. He believes the planning for the City
8 should be top level, which includes an SFL zone. He believes requests should be brought in phases and
9 reviewed by the City until they are acceptable. From there they would be reviewed by the Planning
10 Commission and the City Council. That will give the City a set of design drawings that have two key things
11 the Planning Commission has been frustrated about; overrunning transportation capabilities and concern of
12 overrunning other infrastructure. He doesn't feel the design follows a logical approach.
- 13 • S Wyatt expressed that the process H Ames explained is the same process used by the City. It should be put
14 together as a concept plan which shows the whole transportation plan, and the developer should not be
15 required to spend too much money in putting it together.
- 16 • H Ames would like to see the developer incorporate the small detail in the general concept.
- 17 • S Wyatt said the Planning Commission makes the ultimate decision on this subdivision.
- 18 • J Bradshaw said how many cars anticipated at any given time of day for the number of units approved, etc.,
19 will be presented so the Planning Commission will have certainties of what will work. He believes the
20 Planning Commission would like the developer to pay for studies, and then the Commission would decide
21 yea or nay. He requested that the City give him and his associates thumbs up or thumbs down.
- 22 • H Ames feels this parcel could be a conditional rezone to assure that the ten acres would be rezoned if the
23 developer did the conceptual work on the whole package. He recommended that the Planning Commission
24 hold off on rezoning the land to see if a satisfactory design will be put in place.
- 25 • J Bradshaw said, "You can always take a zone back. We can submit a plan, and you can deny it. By giving
26 a zone, you don't give approvals to building anything."
- 27 • B Bagley added that this would open the City up for a lawsuit. He doesn't believe the City should take
28 responsibility for J Bradshaw's success.
- 29 • J Bradshaw respected that perspective but believes there should be trust on both sides. Ultimately, he
30 cannot do anything unless the Planning Commission okays this. The first step for him is to get the rezone.
31 He explained that is a very critical piece of property for them.
- 32 • H Ames would like hand sketches as to how this fits in. He feels the City must start saying, "Prove to us
33 why we should rezone it." He believes a commercial entity will come to make money, but the philosophical
34 argument is that residents of the City are affected, and they want to make sure the development does not
35 create a negative impact on them. He feels that every rezone should be uplifting to the city of Providence.
36 The Planning Commission, the City Council, and the Mayor should look at the land like it is "ours".
- 37 • B Bagley said, "We do not want to have the same problem with Center Street. We are left with the impact
38 of the development."
- 39 • J Bradshaw explained that the issues are dealt with in the preliminary plat and with the final plat stages.
40 They are not zoning issues.
- 41 • L Campbell recommended bringing this item in as a public hearing during the next meeting.
- 42 • Linda Goetze believes the only specific suggestion to resolve concerns in the north are to connect 500 North
43 to Spring Creek Parkway and feels it will never happen. She believes the Master Plan is too out of date to
44 address or resolve this problem. She believes the Master Plan, as well as the transportation plan, should be
45 updated by the Planning Commission before anything is allowed to happen.
- 46 • B Bagley also believes the Commission shouldn't act until the updates are complete.
- 47 • Bob Bissland informed the Commission that S Wyatt did send firm advice to not rezone the 127 acres. The
48 City Council went along with the Planning Commission's recommendations, and everyone thought it was
49 great to wait until the infrastructure had been planned out. Two weeks later, a reconsideration was made
50 based on fact the Mayor said a whole quorum wasn't available. During the same meeting, the City Council
51 discussed the SFL zone. The reconsideration was not made to put it into SFL. He believes the Mayor said
52 more City Council members should have been present for the vote. He stressed to the Commission that they

1 did send a solid message to the City Council. He said their decision had nothing to do with the SFT or SFL
2 zone, but it was based on water, transportation, and so forth.

- 3 • Laura Fisher believes 400 North would not have a big enough right-of-way and that the driveways in that
4 area are too steep to allow traffic along them.
- 5 • S Bankhead explained that DRC was concerned with transportation, and they recommended not accepting a
6 rezone at this time. She reminded the Commission that they can submit it to the DRC as an overlay.
- 7 • L Campbell felt it should be brought as a public hearing.
- 8 • B Bagley felt more information must be given before a decision is made.
- 9 • J Russell felt the Commission should listen to what the citizens have to say, and then come back with
10 solutions that will resolve the concerns.
- 11 • S Wyatt suggested proceeding with open diligence.
- 12 • B Bagley asked if that means it cannot be continued. S Wyatt said the purpose of the public hearing would
13 be to gather information.
- 14 • H Ames believes the developer has been sensitized and will anticipate some of the concerns. Otherwise, it
15 will be a waste of time.
- 16 • B Bagley recommended scheduling this for public hearing on September 12. It will be followed with a
17 recommendation at the following meeting. He also explained that he called the newspaper to see why the
18 posting wasn't in the newspaper. He believes he has resolved that issue.

19
20 **Item No. 2. The Providence City Planning Commission will discuss a request from Amsource Providence,**
21 **LLC, for approval of an amended final plat of Alder Square by adding Lot 111.**

- 22 • S Bankhead asked S Wyatt if this needs to be posted for 45 days. S Wyatt doesn't remember.
- 23 • S Bankhead explained that this public hearing must be published for four consecutive weeks in the
24 newspaper. The first the Planning Commission could hear this would be on September 12, 2007. It can be
25 listed as a study item on the next agenda, but she would like to be able to post it tonight.
- 26 • H Ames asked why a representative from Amsource didn't come tonight.
- 27 • S Wyatt commented that the Commission can deny it because he didn't show up.
- 28 • Marilyn Bell questioned what the request was for.
- 29 • B Bagley explained that Amsource wants to attach more retail space to Phase 1 instead of Phase 2, and they
30 want to amend the final plat to include Lot 111.
- 31 • M Bell felt the development next to Macey's is a disgrace.
- 32 • S Wyatt recommended moving this item to a public hearing.
- 33 • B Bagley asked S Bankhead to draft a letter to Amsource saying that it will be held as a public hearing and
34 that it will not come back as a study item.

35
36 **Item No. 3. The Providence City Planning Commission will discuss livability standards.**

- 37 • B Bagley invited L Goetze to give her thoughts.
- 38 • H Ames wondered why this is listed as a study item. He believes livability standards are subjective and will
39 be hard to establish.
- 40 • J Russell appreciated L Goetze's enthusiasm, but would like to hear what K Baker received from Provo.
- 41 • K Baker explained that Provo City's information was given to the City for review.
- 42 • J Russell would like to have someone who wrote the standards give their objectives and then let the
43 Commission decide whether it is worth the time and effort to consider.
- 44 • H Ames asked how the livability standards were created.
- 45 • K Baker explained that Provo determined what the livability standards were for traffic on each of their
46 roads. If the traffic increased, the developer was told he couldn't proceed until another road was built. The
47 city itself determined what it wanted for standards with the help of an engineer. They did several traffic
48 studies and came up with a number.
- 49 • B Bagley and H Ames asked if the standard is only for traffic.
- 50 • K Baker said it is a traffic plan livability standard.

- 1 • L Goetze added that Providence City hired a study to be done. They asked the engineer for guidance on
2 safety issues on various roads. He said it is not just an engineering issue, and he mentioned Provo and their
3 use of the livability standards. That is when K Baker did the research. She informed the Commission that
4 the information can be accessed online. She explained that it takes into account the ease of backing out of
5 driveways, pedestrian traffic, and quality of life issues that are not traffic related on residential streets.
6 Provo also identified collector streets so that livability standards can be primarily incorporated for
7 designated residential areas. Higher amounts of traffic were allowed for commercial areas. K Baker and the
8 heritage committee recommended that livability standards be adopted for the historical area, and that all
9 residential traffic be routed around that area. She believes issues such as friendly neighborhoods, comfort,
10 and issues like that should be addressed.
- 11 • H Ames said he struggles with translating livability standards to something fair and equitable across the
12 board. He believes the Planning Commission should look at livability with everything they do.
- 13 • K Baker said it is given as a guideline.
- 14 • L Fisher remembers roadblock discussions. The people contracted to do the study determined gridlock
15 based on observational studies to keep the traffic moving.
- 16 • B Bissland felt livability wasn't open space; it was strictly an empirical value given by the traffic engineer.
17 He started with a gridlock and worked back. Provo came up with 1,800 cars per day as a number to use for
18 their livability standard, and it was based on traffic only.
- 19 • B Bagley read a letter presented by K Baker that was given to the Commission in February.
- 20 • K Baker hopes that as the City adopts a transportation plan, it would have a guideline for the number of cars
21 on residential roads, and if it looks like the traffic would exceed that amount, the City would need to create
22 another road. She said the DRC recommended not changing the zoning until a plan to get traffic off the
23 bench was in place.
- 24 • L Goetze exclaimed that the City has said there is no way to deny a developer because of traffic concerns.
25 She felt traffic should be considered.
- 26 • S Bankhead briefed the Commission on a meeting that was held with Wendell Morse (County-wide
27 Planner), Jeff Gilbert (the County Transportation Planner), Bob Beutler with Cache Valley Transit District,
28 John Russell, Randy Eck, Max Pierce, and Council Member Baker. She explained that groundwork was
29 laid at that meeting. Those in attendance got an idea of how the County views the transportation plan.
30 Meetings will now be held regularly to look at busing routes for the citizens to utilize mass transit, and to
31 identify traffic use on different streets to determine which ones must move a larger volume of cars. Those
32 issues will be narrowed down and then will be incorporated in a plan with credibility.
- 33 • H Ames asked what the City will expect to produce.
- 34 • S Bankhead said it will be a guideline, although some issues may require legal council. If there are things
35 that can be put in ordinance form, the City will do that.
- 36 • H Ames felt the developer should fund scientific traffic studies and the City conduct them. He would like to
37 speak with someone from Provo to see how they put the "meat" into the livability standards.
- 38 • B Bagley questioned if other cities have done this as well.
- 39 • S Bankhead said others have given presentations. She will check to see if someone other than Provo has
40 incorporated them.
- 41 • B Bagley believes transportation is a major issue.
- 42 • B Bissland explained that the engineer Providence City hired to conduct studies previously was the same
43 engineer Provo consulted with.
- 44 • S Bankhead stated that County representatives will not be attending the next meeting, but they gave the City
45 a good amount of information to start with. They will report their progress to the Planning Commission.
46 Providence City belongs to the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization. They have a Cache Technical
47 Advisory Committee which is made up of City administrators and managers, and depending upon the size
48 and shape of the city, some engineers are included. The CMPO consists of mayors, or executives from the
49 County and two professional members from the County planning office. She said Logan is redoing their
50 transportation plan, and it will eventually affect Providence City. Bill Young, Logan City's head engineer,
51 gave information on their MPO plan and said it will be incorporated. She encouraged the Council to go to
52 their public hearings to see some of the ideas they are starting to consider.

- 1 • H Ames felt this should be kept as a study item.
- 2 • S Bankhead said they would like to get the Commission's input.
- 3 • B Bagley believes transportation issues are often ignored. He felt that previously, the City developed and
- 4 then tried to get the transportation plan in place. He feels adopting a livability standard would be a good
- 5 place to start.
- 6 • S Bankhead said the environmental impact assessment on the Logan-Providence corridor is in the office for
- 7 public view. Two copies are available for those who would like to look at them or to copy pages.
- 8 • B Bagley suggested looking at other leads with the Provo livability standards. S Bankhead explained that
- 9 the livability standards are in a big (500 double sided page) document. She will pull the chapter that can
- 10 give the facts.

11 **Item No. 4. The Providence City Planning Commission will discuss street front and side yard fences in**
 12 **Commercial Districts 10-8-1 Space Requirement Chart.**

- 13 • S Bankhead said that nothing in the ordinances clearly works with commercial fences. Some ordinances are
- 14 listed in the landscaping section, but there are no solid rules for commercial fences. The City would like to
- 15 go forward with this to the City Council to give them basis in working with the developers. These include
- 16 space requirements, obstruction of vision, and things like that in commercial zones. A few businesses
- 17 would like to uses fences as part of their landscaping, and by adopting an ordinance, the tools will be in
- 18 place. The current area chart lists fence height restrictions. The City does not allow fences in the front
- 19 yards of commercial buildings or on street side yards. The fence by the bank under the City's current
- 20 ordinance would not be permitted. Staff would like the Planning Commission to establish conditional uses
- 21 to mitigate uses of the fence through the process.
- 22 • H Ames felt the DRC makes the decision to fence or not to fence.
- 23 • J Russell felt conditional uses are arbitrary.
- 24 • S Bankhead said criteria can be set up that must be met.
- 25 • J Russell asked what the parameters are.
- 26 • S Bankhead explained that designs in place would be used.
- 27 • J Russell asked if a public hearing could be held and S Bankhead could present the standards at that time.
- 28 • J Russell noted that some action items listed in the back of the minutes from the last meeting have not been
- 29 addressed. He would still like to meet with Max to discuss the construction drawings for the Cove
- 30 subdivision.
- 31 • S Bankhead explained that D Hogan asked not to be on the agenda tonight. M Pierce and R Eck were
- 32 scheduled to be here and will attend when the Cove is on the agenda.
- 33 • S Bankhead also explained that the County is going through the appeal process of the 2006 census, and they
- 34 haven't got the information available to give to Providence City.

35
 36 **ITEMS FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

37 **Item No. 1. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for recommendation a code**
 38 **amendment changing Providence City Code Title 11 Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 3 Plat Procedures**
 39 **and Requirements and Chapter 5 Public Improvements to provide consistency with the Land Use**
 40 **Authority ordinances and recent changes to the Providence City Department of Public Works Standards**
 41 **and Specifications Manual.**

- 42 • S Bankhead explained that the new corrections were made in blue ink. She discussed the term "accurate
- 43 within a range" with M Pierce, and he gave the same answer B Bissland gave during the last meeting. The
- 44 changes made were on the preliminary plat on page 2 of 8, the red letter E. She asked if it fits the desires of
- 45 the Commission.
- 46 • The next change is on page 7 concerning the final plat process. Staff review was changed to read exactly
- 47 the same as it reads in the preliminary plat process.
- 48 • There were no additional changes in Chapter 5.
- 49 • B Bagley said the water transfer depends upon the ballot. S Bankhead agreed.

50 **Motion that Item No. 1. be recommended for approval – H Ames, Second – L Campbell.**

51 **Vote: Yea: H Ames, B Bagley, L Campbell, J Russell**
 52 **Nay: None**

