

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

2 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332

3 February 6, 2018 6:00 p.m.

4
5 **Call to Order:** Robert James, Planning Commission Chairman

6
7 **Workshop Item:**

8 **Item No. 1:** The Providence City Planning Commission will hold a joint workshop with the Providence City Council
9 and City Staff to discuss a draft of the general plan, prepared by CRSA. The General Plan is a comprehensive policy
10 document that is used to help guide the City in its future growth and change.

11
12 R James asked for opinions of how to begin the discussion.

13 R Cecil recommended going chapter by chapter to work on objectives and goals as the Planning Commission did at
14 their previous meeting.

15 Mayor Drew recommended going through the general plan to pick out what to keep instead of picking out what
16 won't work for Providence City. He was very frustrated when reading through the document because he felt that
17 much of it doesn't apply to Providence. He felt it would be quicker and easier to highlight what would work and
18 could be implemented instead of highlighting what wouldn't work and doesn't apply to Providence.

19 Sharell Eames felt similarly to the Mayor. She felt that much of what is in the proposed general plan doesn't apply
20 to Providence City.

21 G Sonntag felt that this document should be such that someone looking to develop within Providence can read this
22 document and get a good sense of what Providence City is and where the City wants to go in the future. He had a
23 hard time bringing together what Providence actually is and how Providence is portrayed in this document. One
24 example he referenced, on page 11 the city vision; he stated that when he reads that statement he doesn't get a
25 vision or a picture in his mind of what Providence is about. He suggested having a motto that states what the city
26 is, having what the City's mission is, in terms of what they are trying to accomplish, and the vision is what they
27 want the City to become. Each of those things should be something they can see in their minds.

28 R James asked Suzie from CRSA to give a small presentation about the general plan and what CRSA's intention was.
29 Suzie, CRSA, the document was structured in such a way to feel like a users guide. The first section provides the
30 graphics and maps, provides an overall framework for the future and some of the ideas that came from the
31 workshops and public feedback. They wanted the first part of the document so that when you read it you really get
32 a sense of what Providence is all about and where it wants to go in the future. The second part of the document,
33 the individual chapters, are policy driven and will give people an idea of how the City plans to move forward in the
34 future. They also wanted the initiatives in the first part of the document to link back to policy within the individual
35 chapters. Suzie provided an overview of each chapter and why they are included.

36 R James asked Suzie what she sees cities use a general plan for.

37 Suzie responded that a general plan is there to help make decisions.

38 R James felt a good place to start was the 5 key initiatives as well as looking back at the previous general plan.

39 It was discussed that as the initiatives were reviewed there was a lot of duplication among the objectives. He felt
40 like he would like to see this presented on a spreadsheet.

41 R James asked if anyone had any concerns about the 5 key initiatives.

42 J Baldwin discussed B Fresz's idea to focus on what is actually able to be done, instead of having a lot of ideas,
43 rather to include goals and objectives that are realistic for the City to accomplish within a reasonable amount of
44 time.

45 R James agreed with J Baldwin that was important but he wanted to make sure everyone agreed on the 5 key
46 initiatives, to have a foundation to build from.

47 Mayor Drew had some concerns when it came to preserving green space, he wondered if the City has intentions to
48 do that.

49 B Fresz reminded everyone that the new LCR zone will require developers to incorporate green space.

50 J Baldwin reported that the last annexation the City Council dealt with the developers showed green space
51 incorporated with their design.

52 Suzie discussed ways the city can require green space when developers want to develop within Providence.

53 R James stated that he felt like there were two approaches that he was hearing. One is that there are specific
54 concerns about some of the objectives. The second is to determine growth for Providence, is Providence willing to
55 hold off a developer until the plans look like the City wants them to, or does the City want to make it easier for

1 developers to develop in Providence.
 2 J Baldwin felt that the City shouldn't write their ordinances to make it easier for developers to develop in
 3 Providence.
 4 Mayor Drew pointed out that developers won't develop unless they make money.
 5 K Eck stated that the City can be creative about how they use open space to accomplish their goals.
 6 Suzie from CRSA, discussed growth that is discussed in the general plan.
 7 Mayor Drew pointed out that developments don't pay for themselves. Commercial developments do, but
 8 residential properties don't. Providence is a city that relies on sales tax.
 9 B Fresz felt that people were focusing too much on the specifics and short term, the general plan should be a long
 10 term plan. He was hoping they could determine where they want the City to be in 50 years. Once that is
 11 determined they can develop a general plan of how to get there and as the years go on be more specific with their
 12 goals but with the end goal in mind.
 13 Discussion ensued concerning how to determine what the City should look like in 50 years. As well as what are
 14 people going to want in the future. Will they want homes with yards or attached homes with no yard maintenance.
 15 Someone felt that it was a good idea to have objectives and to plan for the future; but that doesn't mean they have
 16 to be firm in detailing everything they want to see in the future.
 17 R James recommended that because not much progress was taking place to start working on the Key Initiatives and
 18 to set a time limit of 5 minutes for initiative.
 19 Key Initiatives
 20 • Initiative #1: Sense of Place
 21 ○ Preserve the 'sense of place' by identifying characteristics that define Providence as a unique
 22 place.
 23 ○ Concerns:
 24 ▪ Vague but no other issues or concerns.
 25 Suzie was asked to provide a review of each objective as they move throughout the document.
 26 ○ The group discussed the first objective under key initiative #1 concerning a city wide network of
 27 centers, nodes and public spaces.
 28 ▪ Mayor Drew felt it was too wordy and wasn't sure what it was supposed to be saying.
 29 ▪ Sharell Eames was concerned about the first word "establish". Because the city is
 30 already so established.
 31 ▪ It was discussed that Providence already has established most of the items mentioned in
 32 the objective. Bike lanes/paths were discussed. Providence has bike paths but they're
 33 not interconnected. The City could decide to add bike lanes to the roads but on some
 34 streets where the City has a 99 foot right of way they would be taking away a portion of
 35 people's front yards.
 36 ▪ S Bankhead discussed they shouldn't be concerned about build-out because the city will
 37 evolve. Also that there are more ways to add bike lanes without widening asphalt.
 38 ▪ R James summarized the core concerns he has heard: the definition of multi-modal
 39 transportation (be more specific); the overall objective is vague but correct, could use
 40 more specifics; the word "establish" at the beginning; incorporate how the city will
 41 evolve with time.
 42 ○ Objective #2: Promote development patterns based on net density that protect environmental
 43 and scenic resources and create a network of preserved natural space as part of the residential
 44 subdivision process.
 45 ▪ Everyone felt that this objective was very well written and the Providence is already
 46 doing this by implementing the Life Cycle Residential zone.
 47 ○ Objective #3: Promote development patterns that facilitate safe and efficient multi-modal
 48 transportation (walking, biking, etc.).
 49 ▪ R Sneddon felt that this objective could be included in the first objective
 50 ▪ R James liked the word "safe" being included, because of concerns expressed earlier in
 51 the meeting.
 52 ○ Objective #4: Identify areas such as prime open space, environmentally sensitive land, and major
 53 utility easements where residential development is not appropriate.
 54 ▪ It was suggested to strike the word "residential"
 55 ▪ S Bankhead stated that the City does recognize certain areas to be considered

- 1 “sensitive”. She also felt it was a good idea to include that objective even though the City
2 is already doing it.
- 3 ■ R Sneddon felt that this objective could be included with the objectives concerning
4 environmental stewardship.
 - 5 ○ Objective #5: Create design standards that allow for flexibility within a defined framework.
 - 6 ■ It was discussed to not include either or both words “design standards”
 - 7 ■ S Bankhead suggested that people were looking at the objective too narrowly, design
8 standards could mean lot sizes, and how streets are designed, not just how buildings
9 look.
 - 10 ■ J Baldwin suggested “Create design that allow for flexibility within a defined framework”
 - 11 ■ R Holloway suggested adding something concerning sustainability and specifying the
12 materials homes or buildings could be built with.
 - 13 ○ Objective #6: Preserve historic assets.
 - 14 ■ How is historic defined?
 - 15 ■ There is a historic district in Providence, but the historic homes are not protected by any
16 regulations or city codes.
 - 17 ■ It was discussed that there is more meaning to the word historic than just buildings,
18 because Spring Creek is historic, as well as the springs.
 - 19 ■ It was suggested to read “Preserve historic assets when feasible”
 - 20 ■ B Fresz inquired about a situation where there is a historic home and someone
21 purchases the property and wants to tear down the home, could the City say no to the
22 new property owners wanting to tear down the home.
 - 23 ■ Suzie stated that it could be added into the objectives or an action plan to create an
24 ordinance to protect historic properties or neighborhoods.
 - 25 ■ B Fresz questioned whether that really is a focus the City has, because they’ve been
26 creating the ability to in-fill. Creating a historic protection plan would negate the ability
27 to in-fill.
 - 28 ○ Objective #7: Create linking network of urban and recreation bicycle paths throughout the City.
 - 29 ■ It was suggested to strike “paths” and replace with “routes”. That could solve a lot of
30 problems.
 - 31 ○ Objective #8: Improve aesthetics of streets and ensure they provide value to the community’s
32 character and identity.
 - 33 ■ Suzie discussed this is an opportunity to reflect the character of the city in a public
34 realm, to take pride in the public infrastructure. It could vary from zone to zone. As an
35 example a downtown area may have wider sidewalks and street trees where in a
36 residential zone they would have standard width sidewalk.
 - 37 ■ B Fresz stated that he didn’t like the word “identify” because it implies action. It was
38 suggested to re-write and have the last part of the objective at the beginning.
 - 39 ■ Someone suggested changing “improve” to “consider”
 - 40 ○ Objective #9: Improve “walkability” and “bikeability” of City.
 - 41 ■ No concerns
 - 42 ○ Objective #10: Provide options for non-drivers (including the young, elderly, and those without a
43 personal vehicle) to travel throughout the City.
 - 44 ■ General feeling that this was included to meet ADA requirements.
 - 45 ■ It was discussed where the bus routes are throughout the city.
 - 46 ■ S Bankhead reported that the buses only have stops on 200 West and Main Street.
 - 47 ○ Objective #11: Retain the views of open space that create the community’s rural character.
 - 48 ■ It was discussed that maintaining open space is becoming more and more difficult.
49 Mayor Drew stated that the best part of Providence are the mountain views, which
50 won’t go away.
 - 51 ■ R James asked if they wanted to include something about that the mountain views.
 - 52 ■ B Fresz stated that he didn’t like the wording of the objective, especially concerning the
53 community’s rural character, because how do you define rural character?
 - 54 ■ It was discussed that there isn’t rural character in Providence anymore, there are no
55 farmers in the city anymore.

- 1 ▪ It was discussed to strike the whole objective.
- 2 ▪ Sharell Eames stated she wished they would strike this objective and the next.
- 3 ○ Objective #12: Protect exist wildlife habitat in a manner that allows both human and animal
- 4 habitation to coexist.
- 5 ▪ It was discussed that new construction and landscaping provides a better environment
- 6 for animals than they find in the mountains so they live in the city where they live better
- 7 than they do on the mountains although they are a nuisance in the city.
- 8 ▪ The general consensus was that this objective needs to be stricken.
- 9 ▪ S Bankhead felt that the objective needs to stay, and pointed out that the City isn't
- 10 protecting the wildlife rather the habitat.
- 11 ○ Objective #13: Create civic open spaces and safe, pedestrian friendly streets. Create parks as
- 12 places of open spaces and centers of community activity as an element of a vital contribution to
- 13 a livable community.
- 14 ▪ It was discussed that this should be separated into two objectives.
- 15 ▪ It was suggested to strike the first sentence, because it has already been addressed.
- 16 ▪ R James suggested striking "as an element"

17 R James explained his thoughts, have simple objectives, have too many objectives, would like to see 3 or 4
18 objectives per initiative with a total of 20 objectives that don't overlap subjects, and have a priority system in place
19 for objectives.

20 B Fresz had some thoughts that the general plan needs to be looking to the future. He suggested having a part one
21 and part two. Part one would be what they have and part two would be what the city will actually do or change.
22 He also felt that if you condense each initiative down to 3 or 4 objectives that they would lose all the substance. He
23 suggested have the priority levels listed in the chapters.

24 It was discussed by Suzie to create a matrix for this first part to show the relationships between the different
25 objectives.

26 S Bankhead felt like the reason it was hard to get through the first initiative was because it had nothing to do with
27 what makes Providence a unique place. What is unique about Providence?

28 R Holloway asked Kristina Eck what makes Providence unique?

29 K Eck reported that people love cache valley because it is different that a lot of places, Providence doesn't have a
30 great reputation, because of bad publicity. Providence Canyon and the views are what make Providence unique.

31 R James noticed that in the first initiative there are 13 objectives in chapter 5 there are 8 objectives. He wondered
32 how and why CRSA chose to duplicate or how they decided where to put each objective.

33 Suzie reported that they choose the objectives based on which objectives support the initiative. They also consider
34 how Providence will grow that will be different than every other city in the valley.

35 J Baldwin felt that S Bankhead was moving in the right direction when she asked how Providence is different than
36 other cities. He felt that Providence is a very family oriented community that values sports and outdoor activities,
37 as well as activities such as the Sauerkraut Festival.

38 K Eck asked why people live in Providence? There are a lot of reasons, the views, the topography, the commercial
39 area, the history. When she thinks of Nibley she thinks of a lot of houses and a few soccer fields.

40 R Cecil reported his reasons for picking Providence when he moved to cache valley, Providence is close to Logan
41 and close to shopping centers and favorite entertainment spots, no septic tank, and the possibility of having a
42 basement.

43 It was discussed that whether or not Providence provides bike trails, it is possible for anyone to bike around the
44 City or even to USU or to shopping centers. Providence is a trail head and has a lot of good things to offer people.

45 S Bankhead pointed out that none of those reasons for what makes Providence great were listed in that section.

46 R James asked how being close to Logan applies to the general plan.

47 Everyone agreed that Providence is conveniently located to Logan, but weren't sure how that relates to the
48 general plan. It was mentioned that if one of Providence's goals is to have convenient access to Logan than they
49 have achieved that goal.

50 Suzie reported that most of the reasons people listed earlier that make Providence different than other cities, are
51 listed within the first initiative they previously discussed and are spread throughout the general plan.

52 K Eck discussed the possibility of changing the name of the first initiative.

53 R James asked how they should move forward.

54 J Baldwin suggested each person editing the document and having someone go through and input all the updates,
55 and then coming back to review it once all the changes have been made.

1 Suzie stated that CRSA could do that once they are submitted changes.
2 R Holloway asked if a timeline could be included with the general plan, which would create a priority list.
3 S Bankhead expressed concern about the Best Practices chapter.
4 It was discussed that the Best Practices chapter is supposed to be a resource for developers that want to develop
5 within Providence.
6 R James suggested that the Best Practices chapter may be best included as an appendix. He felt like good
7 information was received tonight, they were able to get a better feeling of what the City Council is concerned with
8 and what the Planning Commission is concerned with.
9 K Eck recommended having a committee consisting of City Council members and Planning Commission members
10 to go through the General Plan sentence by sentence.
11 B Fresz recommended going through the overall goal for chapters 5 – 9.
12
13 Chapter 5: Direct future growth in Providence in a fiscally and environmentally resilient manner that is consistent
14 with the existing visual character of the town.
15 It was discussed that Providence doesn't have an existing visual character of the town, because there is a wide
16 variety of character throughout Providence.
17 Everyone felt comfortable with the changes the Planning Commission proposed to the chapter 5 overall goal.
18 **"Direct future growth in Providence in a fiscally and environmentally resilient manner that fosters a sense of**
19 **community."**
20
21 Chapter 6: **"Provide a safe, efficient, and comprehensive multi-modal transportation system that connects and**
22 **serves all residents and provides them with access within the City and to the larger region."**
23 There were no proposed changes.
24
25 Chapter 7: Planning housing opportunities for all people, regardless of income level, while maintaining the
26 aesthetic qualities and public service levels Providence residents currently enjoy.
27 Planning Commission members opted to cut the rest of the sentence "and public service levels Providence
28 residents currently enjoy".
29 A possible new wording for the overall goal could be (as proposed by S Bankhead) **"Planning housing**
30 **opportunities for all people, regardless of income level, while maintaining the qualities that foster a sense of**
31 **community."**
32 The possibility of referencing section 5.3 in this chapter was discussed.
33 R James discussed adding a principle in this chapter to remind future planning commissions, city council and city
34 staff that section 5.3 does apply to chapter 7.
35 B Fresz noted the structural differences between chapter 7 and all the other chapters. He stated that he would like
36 it to be consistent throughout the whole document.
37 Suzie from CRSA, stated that chapter 7 is structured differently because it was written by a different group, so this
38 chapter still needs some work.
39
40 Chapter 8: Make city decisions that protect environmental resources such as open space, water quality, and
41 wildlife habitat.
42 B Fresz felt that air needed to be added to the goal. He also discussed the possibility of creating a distinction
43 between storm and culinary water.
44 Multiple people felt it would be better to keep water as is.
45 B Fresz also mentioned that there was no mention of minimizing impact.
46 R James brought to everyone's attention the first objective it discusses minimizing impact without saying those
47 exact words.
48 J Baldwin felt the goal is good as is.
49 R James felt that something could be stated in the objectives about protecting resources.
50 A possible change to the goal could read "Make city decisions that protect environmental resources and minimize
51 impact or use of air, open space, water quality, and wildlife habitat."
52 S Bankhead discussed the possibility of adding something to the goal concerning natural and environmental
53 resources.
54 B Fresz felt it was important to include "environmental impact" in the goal.
55 It was discussed to add "waterways as well as water quality".

1
2 Chapter 9: Manage public services – water, sewer, annexation, parks and recreation facilities – in a manner that
3 meets the needs of city residents now without compromising the ability to meet future needs.
4 R James reported the Planning Commission felt good about this goal besides trying to define public services. So
5 they wouldn't be listed out specifically.

6
7 B Fresz made a general note that a strategy is an action plan of how to accomplish a goal, the strategy sections
8 should be where the priorities and timelines should be listed.

9 There was an idea to have long term and short term strategies.

10 A plan was made as to how to move forward with the general plan. Suzie from CRSA, was to make the appropriate
11 changes to the goals and objectives that were discussed and send changes to S Bankhead before the next meeting
12 on February 15, 2018. It was discussed whether or not to work on the initiatives or chapters first. It was decided to
13 work on the chapters first so the initiatives could be determined by the chapters. It was decided that the Planning
14 Commission will continue to work on the objectives and then pass it on to the City Council to work on the
15 strategies. The City Council will do the fine tuning of the general plan.

16
17 **Motion to close workshop meeting of February 6, 2018 made by R Cecil, seconded by R Holloway.**

18
19 **Vote**

20 **Yea: R Cecil, B Fresz, R Holloway, R James, J Parker**

21 **Nay: None**

22
23 Prepared by K Soelberg.

24 **MINUTES APPROVED ON FEBRUARY 28, 2018**

25
26
27
28
29 _____
Robert James, Chair

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder