

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**  
2 **Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332**  
3 **April 24, 2019 6:00 p.m.**

4  
5 **Call to Order:** Gary Sonntag, Chair  
6 Attendance: Gary Sonntag, Rowan Cecil, Ruthann Holloway, Robert Perry, Laura Banda  
7 (alternate), Joshua Paulsen (alternate)  
8 Absent: John Parker  
9 Voting Alternate: L Banda

10  
11 **Approval of the Minutes:**

12 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for April 10, 2019.

13 **Motion to approve the minutes of April 10, 2019. R Cecil – Second – R Perry.**

14 **Vote:**

15 **Yea: G Sonntag, R Cecil, L Banda, R Holloway, R Perry**

16 **Nay:**

17 **Excused: J Parker**

18 Discussion:

- 19
  - Page 6 Line 299 change name of chair to Gary Sonntag

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
  - R Holloway addressed the commission as a citizen. She asked about getting an ordinance on the agenda  
25 related to accessory apartments/rental rooms in existing houses.
  - S Bankhead said that city staff is working on this, and it may be a study item on the next planning  
26 commission meeting.

27  
28  
29 **Public Hearing(s):** None

30  
31 **Study Items(s):**

32 **Item No. 1. Ordinance and Design Standards for Life Cycle Residential Zone, LCR**

33 The Commission will review and discuss the proposed changes for Title 10 Chapter 4, LCR Zone.

34 **Motion to table the study item –R Cecil –Second – R Holloway**

35 **Vote:**

36 **Yea: G Sonntag, R Cecil, L Banda, R Holloway, R Perry**

37 **Nay:**

38 **Excused: J Parker**

- 39
  - The City Attorney, Chad Woolley, asked in a letter that this item be tabled until he has sufficient time to  
40 review it.

41  
42 **Item No. 2. General Plan Map of Future Re-Zone of Existing Districts and Annexation Areas (Map)**

43 The Commission will review and discuss the proposed changes to the map.

- 44  
45
  - G Sonntag pointed out three areas for discussion: the southwest corner of the city adjacent to Millville,  
46 the southeast corner of the city on the bench, and the north part of the city adjacent to River Heights.
  - S Bankhead said that Millville's plan shows a north-south road running west of 480 West and Meadow  
47 Lane.
  - The possible extension of Garden Drive was discussed, as well as connecting to the road that runs in front  
48 of Ridgeline High School (300 West in Millville).
  - In the southwest area near garden drive, there is county land that is indicated on the Map for future  
49 annexation. S Bankhead explained that we received an annexation petition for a parcel within that area  
50 (Parcel #02-96-0058).

- 54 • J Paulsen noted that on the Map this parcel is marked as Commercial Highway District. He asked what
- 55 zone the petitioners are requesting.
- 56 • S Bankhead said that they have not yet requested a zone, but that they will likely request Single Family
- 57 High or Multi Family Residential, because they would like to build an active adult community.
- 58 • J Paulsen noted that if we extend the road southward as was discussed above, both the property under
- 59 discussion and the one to the west of it would be available for commercial development.
- 60 • R Cecil felt that the parcel in question doesn't fit commercial. J Paulsen felt that it could be LCR. R Cecil
- 61 agreed.
- 62 • G Sonntag said that he understood R Cecil's point. The parcel has residential areas on two sides. Millville's
- 63 planned commercial is west of it. He asked if we should keep the residential boundary consistent.
- 64 • R Holloway asked if it is possible to zone an area as undetermined if we don't know what to do with it yet.
- 65 Once we zone it, then we have to allow the uses permitted in that zone.
- 66 • G Sonntag said that the agricultural zone fulfills this purpose.
- 67 • R Holloway suggested leaving it as agricultural.
- 68 • G Sonntag said that it sounds like the commission agrees that Millville's transportation plan for the area
- 69 isn't the best option. Extending Garden Drive is a better approach.
- 70 • R Cecil spoke about connecting Garden Drive to Ridgeline High School. He said that in the south near the
- 71 school, commercial, such as fast food restaurants, would make sense. He questions whether it would fit
- 72 further north.
- 73 • S Bankhead explained that if we zone the parcel agricultural to avoid making a decision, this would allow
- 74 developers to have more influence on what the zone will be when it is developed. It would also set the
- 75 neighbors up to be angry, because they will expect the parcel to stay agricultural if it says agricultural on
- 76 the future zoning map.
- 77 • J Paulsen explained that even if we designate the parcel as agricultural, the City Council will ultimately
- 78 decide the zone. Leaving it as agricultural simply allows the council to make a decision without Planning
- 79 Commission input.
- 80 • R Holloway asked about using Mixed Use zoning. This could allow a buffer zone of residential against the
- 81 current homes in the neighborhood. Then, it could transition to commercial.
- 82 • G Sonntag suggested zoning it Single Family Residential.
- 83 • R Cecil referred to county parcel #02-117-0022, south of the terminus of Garden Drive. He explained that
- 84 the two subdivisions to the north are zoned Single Family Residential and Single Family Traditional. This
- 85 new property could adopt either one of those zones.
- 86 • G Sonntag said that we should be careful about Mixed Use, because we would want to be sure that having
- 87 commercial and residential in the same neighborhood would work for the market.
- 88 • J Paulsen said that the developer will apply for a rezone if they need to. They may consider what is
- 89 happening in Millville and the surrounding area, and opt for either commercial or residential. However, by
- 90 designating the area as Mixed Use, we would be signaling to the residents that it could go either way.
- 91 • R Cecil said that Mixed Use is not selling.
- 92 • The Commission decided to designate the two parcels south of the terminus of Garden Drive (02-117-
- 93 0022 and 00-117-0023), which are currently designated as Commercial General District, as Mixed Use
- 94 District.
- 95 • J Paulsen talked to Vice President White at USU about the USU farm. They do not have any plans to
- 96 change the use of the property. If they did change it, it would be a politically sticky issue. We should act
- 97 under the impression that it is going to stay the same.
- 98 • The Commission decided to leave the properties in the southwest corner that are designated on the map
- 99 as Single Family Residential and Single Family Traditional, which are to the east of the properties
- 100 discussed above, as Single Family Residential and Single Family Traditional.
- 101 • The commission discussed the southeast corner of the city. The property east of Grandview Drive that was
- 102 recently rejected by the city council for a Life Cycle Residential zone (Parcel #s 02-116-0004 and 03-036-
- 103 0027) is currently zoned Single Family Large. Last meeting, the commission discussed designating that as
- 104 Single Family Traditional.
- 105 • R Holloway asked if we are considering this in order to address the concerns of the current residents.
- 106 • G Sonntag noted that Single Family Traditional is the zone of the surrounding areas.

- 107 • The Hillcrest Subdivision was discussed. S Bankhead explained that the area is zoned Single Family Estate,  
108 but the developer was able to build Single Family Traditional because that was the property's zone when  
109 they applied for their preliminary plat. The city council changed the zone to Single Family Estate, but the  
110 state Office of the Property Rights Ombudsman decided that it was too late to require the developer to  
111 change their plans.
- 112 • G Sonntag asked if the commission was comfortable designating the highlands property that was recently  
113 rejected for LCR to Single Family Traditional.
- 114 • J Paulsen asked about the availability of Single Family Large lots in the city. He feels that there are people  
115 who want those kinds of lots. He is not opposed to some SFT in that area, but he wonders if there will be  
116 enough Single Family Large lots available if the entire parcel is zoned SFT.
- 117 • R Cecil said that some buyers who want large lots buy two smaller lots and combine them.
- 118 • J Paulsen is also concerned about the slopes on that land. An SFT lot makes it more difficult to  
119 accommodate the slope, especially on the south side of that property.
- 120 • S Bankhead said that if the property is zoned Single Family Traditional, the developer can still make lots  
121 that are larger. If it is zoned Single Family Large, however, the developer cannot make lots that are  
122 smaller. Thus, zoning it for a smaller lot size provides more flexibility.
- 123 • L Banda agrees that some land should be set aside for larger lots. There is also an expectation when  
124 someone buys SFL land about the types of houses that will be going in around them.
- 125 • R Holloway said that SFT would provide more flexibility. We should consider the financial situation of the  
126 majority of the people that would be moving there, and provide a move-up home for middle income  
127 buyers. There are still properties zoned SFL north of Canyon Road for those who want them.
- 128 • G Sonntag said that we could leave it SFL, and if the developer wants something else, they could petition  
129 for a rezone.
- 130 • J Paulsen said that he can see both sides of the issue. Currently, the developer hasn't done anything with  
131 the land, probably because it is zoned SFL. If we zoned it SFT, maybe the developer would develop it.
- 132 • G Sonntag said that part of the commission's job is to look to the future and provide ways for growth to  
133 occur in the right way. Giving the flexibility of SFT could encourage growth to occur.
- 134 • S Bankhead explained that there is a zone in Providence City Code that has not yet been utilized. It is a  
135 Planned Unit Development zone, where the developer must present a plan prior to development.
- 136 • G Sonntag said that the ability to submit any plan creates too much flexibility.
- 137 • The commission decided to designate this area SFT.
- 138 • The commission discussed the north side of the city in the area of 500 North and 300 East.
- 139 • There is property in this area that has been zoned LCR by the city council. There is another parcel north of  
140 this that was approved to be zoned LCR by the council, but is under referendum. S Bankhead explained  
141 that this second parcel's development is on hold while the sponsors of the referendum seek to gather the  
142 required number of signatures. If they do gather the required number, development will be on hold again  
143 until the election in November, at which point the voters will decide whether to approve the council's  
144 decision.
- 145 • R Cecil asked whether if the annexation fails as a result of the referendum, the owner can then develop  
146 through Cache County instead of through Providence City.
- 147 • S Bankhead said that she is not familiar with the county's zones for development, but said that the county  
148 generally prefers that an applicant annex into the city that they are adjacent to.
- 149 • J Paulsen felt that the county would not want to service that island of land for development.
- 150 • J Paulsen spoke about parcel #02-029-0028, located west of the property currently zoned LCR, and said  
151 that he attended a River Heights city meeting where it was discussed. He said that Jeff Jackson, the  
152 developer of the LCR property, wants to put an active adult community there under the LCR zone. River  
153 Heights is not opposed to that idea, but many residents are opposed to the LCR zone itself because it is  
154 not well enough defined.
- 155 • R Cecil brought up the parcels to the west of Hwy 165 that are shown on the map as LCR. He would like  
156 them to remain LCR.
- 157 • The commission decided to leave them as LCR.

158  
159 **Item No. 3. Providence Planning Commission Bylaws:** The Commission will review and discuss the Bylaws and  
160 consider potential updates.

161 The commission decided to table this discussion until the next meeting.  
162 • R Cecil asked to make a comment since he will not attend the next meeting. He suggested that the rules  
163 should be amended to allow voting for the next chair in the case of the resignation of the current chair.  
164

165 **Reports:**

166  
167 **Staff Reports:** Any items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as informational only.

- 168 • No Staff Reports  
169

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

- 172 • No Commission Reports  
173

174  
175 **Motion to adjourn:** –R Cecil, Second – B Perry

176 **Vote:**

177 **Yea:** R Cecil, J Parker, R Perry, G Sonntag, R Holloway

178 **Nay:**

179 **Excused:** John Parker  
180

181 Meeting adjourned approximately 8:10

182 Minutes prepared by Jesse Bardsley  
183  
184

185 \_\_\_\_\_  
186 Gary Sonntag, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_ Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder

187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192