

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**

2 **Providence City Office Building**

3 **15 South Main, Providence UT 84332**

4 **August 26, 2015 6:00 pm**

5
6 Chairman: Larry Raymond

7 Attendance: Kirk Allen, Heather Hansen, Robert James, Wendy Simmons

8 Excused: William Baker, Barry Nielsen

9
10 **Approval of the Minutes:**

11 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of August 12, 2015.

12 **Motion to approve minutes of August 12, 2015: H Hansen, second – K Allen**

13 **Vote: Yea: K Allen, H Hansen, R James, L Raymond, W Simmons**

14 **Nay: None**

15 **Excused: None**

16 **Abstained: None**

17 **Action Items:**

18 **Item No. 1. Proposed Final Plat:** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval, a final plat for
19 500 North LLC Subdivision, a 33-Lot residential subdivision located generally at 500 North 450 East.

- 20 • Danny Macfarlane from Civil Solutions addressed the Commission. Lot 21 is a bit larger (.77), and Lot 20 is
21 smaller. It is now called Providence Hollow.
- 22 • K Allen felt identifying markers showing the name of the subdivision will be very nice.
- 23 • H Hansen asked about the width of the road by the church and if there was going to be a fence on the
24 west side of the park. She asked about the 12” water line, the 24” storm drain and the 8” sewer line.
- 25 • D Macfarlane answered her questions and clarified the different lines that will be run for the
26 development.
- 27 • K Allen asked if the city water (the reservoir up the canyon) provides for this subdivision.
- 28 • S Bankhead said it will probably come out of Eck Hill, but they are all inter-connected. In winter it will
29 come out of the canyon since there will be no pumping during the winter months.
- 30 • S Bankhead said the developers are also bringing irrigation shares.

31 **Motion to approve the final plat for 500 North LLC Subdivision, now named Providence Hollow, subject to
32 conditions listed on final plat: W Simmons, second – H Hansen**

33 **Vote: Yea: K Allen, H Hansen, R James, L Raymond, W Simmons**

34 **Nay: None**

35 **Excused: None**

36 **Abstained: None**

37 **Study Items:**

38 **Item No. 1. Proposed Code Amendment:** The Providence City Planning Commission will discuss a proposed code
39 amendment to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations and Parking
40 Requirements, Section 3 Setbacks allowing an uncovered porch to extend into the front yard setback.

- 41 • J Baldwin handed out a sketch to the Commissioners of what has been discussed in the past few meetings
42 regarding uncovered porches in the front yard setback. He reviewed the drawings. There are only a few
43 homes in Providence that this would apply to.
- 44 • H Hansen asked if a site plan would have to be submitted to zoning for a porch and a ramp.
- 45 • J Baldwin said it will need to be submitted.
- 46 • J Baldwin felt it would be better to deal with the porch only and not the stairs or the approach to the front
47 porch. This will not apply to newer homes, only homes that are older and do not meet current building
48 code for entry landings.
- 49 • H Hansen said the wording should be changed on 2.a.i. to read: “Porch may not extend into front setback
50 more than 4’ from the front of the house. Stairs and ramps are excluded. Maximum porch size is 24 sf.
51 Roof may not extend more than one foot past the front of porch.”
- 52 • R James said you may have to go more than 4 feet into the setback for some older homes that may have
53 been built before front setbacks were established and therefore, are encroaching on the setbacks.
- 54 • J Baldwin said 4’ will be the maximum.

- 1 • R James suggested, “but may not extend more than 4’ from the front of the home.” That will give a
- 2 4’ porch no matter where the front of the home is.
- 3 • L Raymond said it also needs to include the maximum porch size of 24 sq ft.
- 4 • S Bankhead said this will need to have a public hearing. Language can be amended based on tonight’s
- 5 discussion.
- 6 • L Raymond said a public hearing will be held, then a recommendation will be made to the City Council.
- 7 • The agreed upon language will read as follows:
- 8 • 2.a.i. A covered, unenclosed entry may extend more than 4’ into the setback but may not extend more
- 9 than 4’ from the front of the house. Stairs and ramps are excluded.
 - 10 a. Maximum porch size is 24 sq.ft.
 - 11 b. Roof may not extend more than 1’ past the front of the porch.
- 12 • 2.a.ii – leave as is.
- 13 • 2.a.iii – leave as is.
- 14 • H Hansen asked if ramps should be included for all homes or not.
- 15 • J Baldwin said that is covered in the ADA requirements and they trump any city ordinance.
- 16 • R James said it is also taken care of in statement ii where it says “but shall not extend further than the
- 17 minimum to meet the grade and landing requirements for ADA access.”
- 18 • S Bankhead said stairs are a problem and it is not clear how far they can go out. The beginning of 10-8-3
- 19 Setback needs to have a general statement. A suggestion would be “stairs, sidewalks, ramps are allowed
- 20 in the setback and do not violate the setback.”
- 21 • R James said 10-8-3 A.2. says “may not project into the required front yard for a distance not to exceed
- 22 four feet..”
- 23 • S Bankhead said that is the one that is a concern. It says steps are prohibited from going into the setback.
- 24 • H Hansen and R James said to just remove the word steps and move 2.A.2 to setbacks generally. Change
- 25 wording in 2.a.1 as noted above.
- 26 • Public hearing will be scheduled for next meeting.

27 Item No. 2. Proposed General Plan Amendments: The Providence City Planning Commission will discuss possible
 28 amendments for the zoning element of the Providence City general plan; including the zoning districts for future
 29 annexation and future rezone of existing districts.

30 Item No. 3. Proposed Code Amendment: The Providence City Planning Commission will discuss a proposed code
 31 amendment to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 4 Establishment of Districts, establishing
 32 regulations for Commercial Neighborhood District by adding Section 6 Commercial Neighborhood District.

- 33 • Items 2 and 3 were discussed together.
- 34 • L Raymond said the Historical Preservation Commission should be involved in this discussion.
- 35 • S Bankhead said inviting them to the next meeting will work for Historical Preservation Commission. As far
- 36 as staff review is concerned, Mayor Calderwood and Councilman Ralph Call are not comfortable with
- 37 Commercial Neighborhood District surrounded by residential. They feel things should be done through
- 38 home business and not strictly commercial. This is an issue that has come up a few times, people want
- 39 this type of a use.
- 40 • R James said someone wanting a neighborhood commercial district is different than Providence City
- 41 needing a neighborhood commercial district.
- 42 • S Bankhead said one business owner approached the City and wanted to do greenhouses to raise
- 43 vegetables to sell from the property as well as at the farmer’s market. They did not live in Providence. This
- 44 was not allowed under current ordinance, but it could have been allowed in a neighborhood commercial
- 45 district. Also, downtown Providence will need to be considered for the future. There will come a time
- 46 when people will not want to live in that area, and there needs to be some opportunity to keep
- 47 residential downtown full of residents.
- 48 • J Baldwin said Midway does something similar to this. If done correctly, it does not distract from the
- 49 neighborhood at all. The business is a fabric shop, but looks like a residential home with landscaping, etc.
- 50 The problem exists in trying to keep the businesses small and not intrusive.
- 51 • H Hansen said that could be accomplished in zoning ordinances and the use chart.
- 52 • S Bankhead said we do have a commercial neighborhood district. It either needs to be taken out or we
- 53 need to figure out a way to make it work. It comes up frequently in meetings, but it never get resolved.

- 1 • K Allen said if we do have a CND, we had better have some regulations. The way it is now, it would be a
- 2 nightmare.
- 3 • J Baldwin asked if there were development standards that would prevent parking lot types of parking.
- 4 • S Bankhead said it can be written to keep the characteristic residential neighborhood look and feel.
- 5 • H Hansen asked about an overlay zone in the downtown area.
- 6 • S Bankhead said there is a downtown area, which is not an overlay zone, but it is an actual definition of
- 7 the downtown area. It mirrors the historic district almost identically.
- 8 • H Hansen felt the historic district is too big for a neighborhood commercial district.
- 9 • S Bankhead said the Commission needs to decide what their vision is for the future of Providence.
- 10 • L Raymond had concerns about the language.
- 11 • S Bankhead said it can all be changed to whatever the Commission wants, further defining parking
- 12 regulations, etc.
- 13 • J Baldwin felt it would be advantageous to look at what other communities are doing and how they are
- 14 regulating CND and making it work; and then using that as a basis to work from.
- 15 • S Bankhead said the Council can be discretionary on zoning. Uses need to be considered carefully. The use
- 16 chart needs to be very specific. That is where the control comes in.
- 17 • R James asked if anything was currently zoned CND. S Bankhead said no.
- 18 • S Bankhead said there is one more zone that needs to be considered and that is Recreational. It is vague
- 19 and needs a definition. Is this something you want to control in the use chart or in as zone?
- 20 • H Hansen asked if both the zone and the use chart didn't need to be addressed.
- 21 • R James asked what other cities do.
- 22 • S Bankhead said she isn't sure, but can look into it.
- 23 • K Allen felt it would be difficult to have a recreational zone.
- 24 • S Bankhead asked what if someone wanted to come in and install batting cages.
- 25 • R James said there is a wide range of what would be considered recreation. He does not think allowing
- 26 recreation in CND would be a good idea. He felt it would be better in a Commercial General District. He
- 27 felt defining recreational uses would be a good place to start.
- 28 • H Hansen did not feel a zone was necessary, but she felt it should be defined.
- 29 • H Hansen will get the residential definitions to Skarlet for next meeting. That needs to be done before this
- 30 can go to public hearing.

31 Item No. 4. Proposed Code Amendment: The Providence City Planning Commission will discuss proposed code
 32 amendments to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 15 Sign Regulations, including but not
 33 limited to adding Feather Flags (Sail Banners).

- 34 • H Hansen asked why there is a 60 day limit on the feather flags/sail banners.
- 35 • S Bankhead said it prevents these signs from becoming permanent. Permanent signs require a permit.
- 36 • R James said the signs permitted for CND zones need to be looked at. There are a lot of signs permitted
- 37 that may not be ideal for that type of zone.

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

- 39 • No staff reports.

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

- 42 • No Commission reports.

43 **Motion to adjourn: R James, second – H Hansen**

44 **Vote: Yea: K Allen, H Hansen, R James, L Raymond, W Simmons**

45 **Nay: None**

46 **Excused: None**

47 **Abstained: None**

48 Meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.

49
50
51
52
53

Larry Raymond, Chairman

Caroline Craven, Secretary