

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**

2 **Providence City Office Building,**

3 **164 North Gateway Drive,**

4 **Providence UT 84332**

5 **October 9, 2019 6:00 p.m.**

6
7 **Call to Order:** Gary Sonntag, Chair

8 **Roll Call of Commission Members:**

9 Present: Rowan Cecil, Joshua Paulsen (voting alternate), Bob Perry, Gary Sonntag

10 Excused: Laura Banda, Ruth Ann Holloway

11
12 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Bob Perry

13
14 **Approval of the Minutes:**

15 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for September 25, 2019.

16 **Motion to approve the minutes of September 25:** — R Cecil, second — J Paulsen

17 **Vote:**

18 **Yea:** R Cecil, B Perry, J Paulsen

19 **Nay:**

20 **Abstained:** G Sonntag

21 **Excused:** R Holloway, L Banda

22 **Corrections:**

23 Line 368: Bob Perry, Vice Chair

24
25 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the Planning Commission to express their views on issues
26 within the City's jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Commission. Remarks are limited to 3
27 minutes per person. The total time allotted to public comment is 21 minutes. Persons wishing to address
28 the Commission during Public Comments should sign on the public comment sign-in sheet located at the
29 entry to the meeting room.

- 30
 - No public comments

31
32 **Action Item(s):**

33 **Action Item Note:** Should the Planning Commission not be able to make a decision or take exception to
34 an Action Item(s), then that item will be tabled and revert back to a study category. The applicant will
35 have 15 minutes to introduce and make a brief presentation.

36
37 Note: The commission decided to rearrange the agenda as follows:

38 **Action Item No. 7. Proposed Amended Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for
39 approval of the Final Plat of Providence Gateway Condominiums Phases C & D Amended; located in the
40 general area of 471 W 15 S, Providence UT.

41 **Motion to approve action item No. 7 Amended Final Plat for phase C & D of Providence Gateway**

42 **Condominiums:** — J Paulsen, second — R Cecil

43 **Vote:**

44 **Yea:** R Cecil, B Perry, G Sonntag, J Paulsen

45 **Nay:**

46 **Abstained:**

47 **Excused:** R Holloway, L Banda

- 48
 - Bryce Goodin of Visionary Homes explained that they would like to change the footprints on the
49 plat to accommodate a greater variety of units. None of the buildings will be larger than before.
50 Some will be smaller. The number of units is the same.

- 51 • S Bankhead said that the landscaping and the site work has been approved already with the
52 original plats. Other than the footprints, there is nothing else changing except the color scheme.
53

54 **Action Item No. 8. Proposed Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval
55 of the Final Plat of Providence Gateway Condominiums Phase F; located in the general area of 470 W 15
56 S, Providence UT.

57 **Motion to approve the final plat of Providence Gateway Condominiums Phase F: — R Cecil, second —**
58 **B Perry**

59 **Vote:**

60 **Yea: R Cecil, J Paulsen, G Sonntag, B Perry**

61 **Nay:**

62 **Abstained:**

63 **Excused: R Holloway, L Banda**

64 Discussion:

- 65 • S Bankhead said that staff did not have any problems with this final plat. The infrastructure has
66 already been installed, and the staff recommends that this phase be approved.
67 • J Paulsen asked about the private road, 15 South, that says it has a “variable width.” Does our
68 code allow private roads to determine their own width?
69 • S Bankhead said that we give private roads a name for emergency purposes, and we make sure
70 that they meet all the criteria for emergency vehicles.
71

72 **Action Item No. 6. Proposed Amended Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for
73 approval Providence Hollow Subdivision Amended Plat of Lots 20 & 21 by adjusting the joint lot line. The
74 applicant is Scott R Watterson. The adjustment is located at 574 N. 520 E, Providence UT.

75 **Motion to approve the Providence Hollow Subdivision amended plat of lots 20 & 21 by adjusting the**
76 **joint lot line: — J Paulsen, second — R Cecil**

77 **Vote:**

78 **Yea: R Cecil, B Perry, J Paulsen, G Sonntag**

79 **Nay:**

80 **Abstained:**

81 **Excused: R Holloway, L Banda**

82 Discussion:

- 83 • S Bankhead said that the amendment meets all zoning codes and fits with the general plan. The
84 owners have planned for the access. Staff recommends that this amendment be approved.
85

86 **Public Hearing(s):** Remarks during the hearing are limited to 5 minutes per person. The total time
87 allotted to hearing comment is 50 minutes. Persons wishing to address the Commission during public
88 hearing should sign on the sign-in sheet for the public hearing located at the entry to the meeting room.
89 You may also email comments to the City Recorder, sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the
90 day of the meeting. By law, email comments are considered public record and will be shared with all
91 parties involved, including the Planning Commission and the applicant.
92

93 **6:10 PM:** Prior to making a recommendation on a proposed rezone, the Planning Commission is holding
94 a public hearing. The proposed rezone was requested by Ralph Call for Pioneer Builders Company Inc.
95 for Parcel No. 02-098-0010, generally known as 32 East Center, Providence UT. The property is currently
96 zone Commercial General District (CGD); the applicant is requesting Multi-Family Medium (MFM).

- 97 • Ralph Daniels of Providence asked how many apartments we are talking about. He was
98 concerned about the traffic by the elementary school.
99 • Jeanell Sealy of Providence asked for more details about what is being proposed.
100

101 **Action Item No. 1. Proposed Rezone:** The Planning Commission will consider for recommendation a
102 request by Ralph Call for Pioneer Builders Company Inc. for Parcel No. 02-098-0010, generally known as
103 32 East Center, Providence UT. The property is currently zone Commercial General District (CGD); the
104 applicant is requesting Multi-Family Medium (MFM).

105 **Motion to recommend for approval the rezone of [a part of] parcel No. 02-098-0010: — B Perry,**
106 **second — J Paulsen**

107 **Vote:**

108 **Yea: K Alder, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

109 **Nay:**

110 **Abstained:**

111 **Excused: R Holloway, L Banda**

112

- 113 • Kip Gilley of Pioneer Builders Company explained that the building in question is east of the Old
114 Rock Church. They are requesting Multi Family Medium so that they can have a night manager
115 live in the basement.
- 116 • Kathleen Alder arrived at 6:25 PM
- 117 • G Sonntag said that the area that they want to rezone would allow for 4 units.
- 118 • K Gilley said that they are only planning on putting three units into the building. The basement is
119 only a half basement.
- 120 • G Sonntag asked about parking. K Gilley said that this building will have use of the parking lot.
121 They have also added two more stalls in addition to what is shown on the current Cache County
122 Parcel Viewer image.
- 123 • R Cecil asked about breaking up the parcel. K Gilley said that the reason that they are only
124 rezoning part of the parcel is that they don't have an intention to put another 4-plex in the back
125 of the parcel. All they want is to have an extended lease in the current building.
- 126 • G Sonntag said that the rest would remain commercial.
- 127 • K Alder asked if they are rezoning the whole parcel. S Bankhead said that they are only rezoning
128 the square footage that they requested. They don't have to split the parcel in order to rezone
129 part of it.
- 130 • R Cecil said that he is concerned about the increased traffic if the applicant tears down the
131 building and builds a fourplex.
- 132 • G Sonntag said that he feels that this rezone is a good approach to foster good use of the
133 property.
- 134 • S Bankhead read from the staff report. She said that the total number of units that would be
135 allowed for the area proposed for rezone would be 4 units. Staff recommends that this be
136 recommended to the city council for approval. S Bankhead explained that the Planning
137 Commission is a recommending body in this case. The City Council will make the final decision.
- 138 • S Bankhead said that we could have changed the code to allow residential use in our commercial
139 zones or for an employee to live within a commercial zone. However, this would have opened
140 our commercial zones to residential treatment facilities. We are not against residential
141 treatment facilities, but we don't want them to use our limited commercial space. They can
142 locate in residential zones. Staff recommended that the applicant seek multi-family zoning so
143 that we could preserve the integrity of our commercial zone.
- 144 • J Paulsen said that at first he was reluctant to recommend this change because of the multi-
145 family zoning, but after discussing it over several meetings, he feels like it makes sense. It is a
146 marginal difference in traffic and occupancy, and encourages the bed and breakfast to thrive.
- 147 • G Sonntag asked about whether the commission can use the word "approve" in their motions
148 on items that are a recommendation to the city council.
- 149 • S Bankhead said that there are some things, such as final plats, for which the Planning
150 Commission has final approving authority. On other things, it has recommending authority. Staff

151 knows the difference, and the commission knows the difference, but the general public might
152 not be able to follow along [unless we specify].

- 153 • G Sonntag asked the staff to include something on the agenda to help us understand when
154 things are to be approved by the commission and when they are only recommendations.
155

156 **6:15 PM:** Prior to making a recommendation on the proposed code amendments to Providence City
157 Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 1-Section 5, by adding requirements for a rezone application,
158 the Planning Commission is holding a public hearing. The purpose of the public hearing is to provide an
159 opportunity for anyone interested to comment on the proposal before action is taken.

- 160 • S Bankhead explained that there is certain information that we require an applicant to submit as
161 part of their rezone application. One important subject is sensitive areas. As technology has
162 improved, so has our ability to identify sensitive areas. We would like to make sure that the
163 developer is aware of sensitive areas prior to the rezone. We don't want to argue with them
164 after the rezone. We also don't want to be caught in a situation where we rezone a piece of
165 property but it has a negative impact due to sensitive areas. In order to identify sensitive areas
166 and give us mitigation strategies for that area, sometimes we need geotechnical reports. This is
167 a significant cost. If it is only a matter of policy, the developer can argue about providing that.
168 However, if we add it to the code, there is less that they can do to object.
- 169 • S Bankhead read from the proposed changes.
- 170 • S Bankhead brought up the proposed language from the Planning Commission in 10-1-5 B(1)G.
171 We really need to base our zone changes on what is in our code rather than on a drawing. After
172 the rezone takes place, the applicant can change from their drawing if they want to.
- 173 • G Sonntag asked what would happen if the applicant did not provide the information the
174 Commission is encouraging them to provide in B(1)G. Will the Commission press them for that
175 information? S Bankhead said that would be a policy decision on the part of the Planning
176 Commission.
- 177 • S Bankhead said that the idea in B(1)G has merit. It is useful to be able to visualize things. She
178 just wants to make sure that the Commission doesn't think that this has very much authority.
179 We can't hold the applicant to their drawing, but we can hold them to what is in the zoning
180 ordinance.
- 181 • K Alder said that B(1)G does not suggest that the applicant provide an engineering drawing. It
182 could be hand drawn on a piece of paper.
- 183 • R Cecil said that if the applicant didn't provide what we wanted, we could delay the item until
184 the next meeting.
185

186 **Action Item No. 2. Proposed Code Amendment:** The Planning Commission will consider for
187 recommendation amendments to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 1-Section 5,
188 by adding requirements for a rezone application.

189 **Motion to recommend to the city council an amendment to the Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning**
190 **Regulations Chapter 1 Section 5: — R Cecil, second — K Alder**

191 **Vote:**

192 **Yea: K Alder, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

193 **Nay:**

194 **Abstained:**

195 **Excused: R Holloway, L Banda**

196 **Discussion:**

- 197 • J Paulsen said that most of our zones are strong enough to establish density. He has an issue,
198 however, with the LCR zone. Letter B(1)G gets us part of the way towards fixing the LCR problem
199 with variable density, but we still have more work to do.

200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247

6:20 PM: Prior to making a recommendation on the proposed code amendments to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 3-Section 6, by adding the information required with an annexation petition, the Planning Commission is holding a public hearing. The purpose of the public hearing is to provide an opportunity for anyone interested to comment on the proposal before action is taken.

- No public comments

Action Item No. 3. Proposed Code Amendment: The Providence Planning Commission will consider for recommendation to the City Council proposed code amendments to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 3-Section 6, by adding the information required with an annexation petition.

Motion to table action item No 3. and make it an action item at the next meeting: — R Cecil, second —

J Paulsen

Vote:

Yea: K Alder, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag

Nay:

Excused: R Holloway, L Banda

Abstained:

- G Sonntag explained the proposed changes. Changes to the first paragraph specify that if someone proposes an annexation with a zone that is not shown on the Future Rezone of Existing Districts map, it should come to the Planning Commission for consideration.
- K Alder asked if people who come in for an annexation request usually have an idea of what they will do with it. S Bankhead said that they do. Most annexations nowadays are requested by developers.
- S Bankhead said that while it has been our policy to have the Planning Commission review a request that does not match with the Future Rezone map, it hasn't been specified in our code.
- S Bankhead said that we can add transportation to the list in 10-3-6 C(1)C.
- K Alder asked if we can put language similar to what was put in the rezone application requirements, that applicants are encouraged to provide information about the type of development that they plan to do.
- S Bankhead said that with annexation requests, we can require more than we can require for rezones. We can require new roads to be built, etc. Adding the comment to encourage them to provide information is a very appropriate thing to do with annexations.
- R Holloway arrived at 7:10 PM
- J Paulsen asked if we could add controls about LCR annexations. We could require as part of the annexation agreement that they specify a certain density. S Bankhead said that she thinks that we could.
- J Paulsen asked if we could enforce the annexation agreement if it specified less density than the zone allowed. S Bankhead said that we can enforce it.
- J Paulsen said that he would like the citizens to be able to know more about an annexation before it happens.
- S Bankhead asked that we continue this item so that we can discuss the language with the city attorney.
- 10-3-6. C(1)C: change utilities to services.
- K Alder asked about the feasibility studies mentioned in 10-3-6 C(1)C. When she did the Macey's property, it took 6 years for the Army Corps of Engineers to get back to them [about wetlands].

- 248 Sometimes, the developer can't get all of the information in time. There should be some
249 flexibility.
- 250 • S Bankhead said that it would be reasonable to expect someone to delineate wetlands as part of
251 the feasibility study. It would not be reasonable to require the mitigations strategies to be a part
252 of the feasibility study.
 - 253 • G Sonntag noted that K Alder will now be a non-voting alternate due to the arrival of R
254 Holloway.

255
256 **6:30 PM:** Prior to making a recommendation on the proposed code amendments to Providence City
257 Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 6-Section 1, by adding accessory apartment unit and
258 amending accessory dwelling unit as permitted in the residential zone, and amending bed and breakfast
259 as conditional in multi-family zones.

- 260 • Ralph Daniels of Providence said that at one time, accessory dwelling units were allowed in the
261 city, and then the ordinance was repealed. Now the city wants to allow accessory dwelling units
262 again, and add accessory apartments as well. How will we maintain the integrity of single family
263 residential zones?

264
265 **Action Item No. 4. Proposed Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for
266 recommendation to the City Council proposed code amendments to Providence City Code Title 10
267 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 6-Section 1, by adding accessory apartment unit and amending accessory
268 dwelling unit as permitted in the residential zone, and amending bed and breakfast as conditional in
269 multi-family zones.

270 **Motion to approve action item No. 4 by amending Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations**
271 **Chapter 6 Section 1 by adding accessory apartment unit and amending accessory dwelling unit as**
272 **permitted in the residential zone, and amending bed and breakfast as conditional in multi-family**
273 **zones: — J Paulsen, second — R Holloway**

274 **Yea: R Cecil, R Holloway, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

275 **Nay:**

276 **Abstained:**

277 **Excused:**

278 **Non-Voting: K Alder**

279 Discussion:

- 280
281 • G Sonntag asked for some history about accessory dwelling units in the city.
- 282 • S Bankhead said that at some time in the 1990s or the 1980s, Providence City allowed someone
283 to convert a part of their home into an apartment. At the time the city did that, they called it an
284 accessory dwelling unit. The code said that one unit had to be owner occupied. People were
285 afraid that there would be a lot of them. They thought that there would be many duplexes in
286 single family homes. However, it was difficult to convert a home to have a separate unit due to
287 the building codes, etc. We didn't have a lot of them. Around 2005, we had a building boom.
288 People were looking to the future and wanting to set up their basement so that they could rent
289 them out. This caused the council to be concerned that they were opening the door to duplexes.
290 The council decided not to allow any more accessory dwelling units.
- 291 • S Bankhead said that the ordinance was very successful when we did it before. There was only
292 one unit that we had complaints about while they were allowed, and it was more of a conflict
293 between neighbors rather than anything to do with the zoning. The big sticking point of the
294 ordinance was that the unit had to be owner occupied. You had to have the owner or a family
295 member that qualified live in one of the units.
- 296 • S Bankhead said that in the last year, the current council has been rethinking accessory dwelling
297 units/apartments in light of housing costs, etc. Requests from homeowners have also increased

- 298 in the last few years to put in accessory apartments. Some homeowners are getting older and
299 want someone else to live in the home with them. We also have had people who want to
300 purchase a house, but need to share the house payments with a renter.
- 301 • S Bankhead said that the current council recently passed an Accessory Dwelling Unit (Detached)
302 ordinance. If the commission would like to consider allowing the apartment (attached), we need
303 to put it in the use chart. Both the accessory apartment and accessory dwelling unit ordinance
304 require a property owner or a qualified representative to live in one of the units.
 - 305 • R Daniels said that accessory dwelling unit and accessory apartment unit have the same
306 definition according to the internet.
 - 307 • G Sonntag said that the city has its own definitions. An Accessory Dwelling Unit is detached,
308 while an Accessory Apartment is within the primary home.
 - 309 • S Bankhead said that the reason that Accessory Dwelling Unit is marked as “permitted” in the
310 use chart is because the city council passed an ordinance (Title 10 Chapter 13) allowing it to be
311 permitted. The Accessory Apartment row is blank on the chart because they are currently not
312 allowed.
 - 313 • J Paulsen asked if different parts of the code trump each other. Currently, there is incongruence
314 between this chart and other parts of the code. S Bankhead said that the newer code generally
315 trumps the older code. In this case, the chapter that allows Accessory Dwelling Units to be
316 permitted would trump the use chart.
 - 317 • J Paulsen noted that this chart is missing the LCR zone. S Bankhead said that we need to update
318 that.
 - 319 • S Bankhead explained that even if the Commission does not want to allow accessory
320 apartments, we need to at least change the title so that we don’t have two chapters with the
321 same title. Accessory Apartments has a blank row after it because it is currently not allowed in
322 any zone.

323
324 **6:35 PM:** Prior to making a recommendation on the proposed code amendments to Providence City
325 Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 12 accessory apartment units to allow for accessory
326 apartment units.

- 327 • No public comments

328
329 **Action Item No. 5. Proposed Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for
330 recommendation to the City Council proposed code amendments to Providence City Code Title 10
331 Zoning Regulations-Chapter 12 accessory apartment units to allow for accessory apartment units.

332 **Motion to approve action Item No 5. to recommend to the city council Title 10 Chapter 12 to allow for**
333 **accessory apartment units: — J Paulsen, second — R Cecil**

334 **Yea: R Cecil, R Holloway, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

335 **Nay:**

336 **Abstained:**

337 **Excused:**

338 **Non-Voting: K Alder**

339 **Discussion:**

- 340 • J Paulsen asked if we are defining in which zones the apartment units will be allowed. He is in
341 favor of sending the chapter to the City Council so that residents can react to it, but he does not
342 want to decide yet where the apartments will be allowed.
- 343 • S Bankhead said that unless it is already written into the code [that the commission is
344 approving], then the zones in which they will be allowed are not yet defined.

345
346 **Study Items(s):**

347 **Item No. 1. PCC 10-8-1, 2, & 3 Set Backs:** Proposed amendments make changes to the setback
348 requirements.

- 349
- 350
- 351
- 352
- 353
- 354
- 355
- 356
- 357
- 358
- 359
- 360
- 361
- 362
- 363
- 364
- 365
- 366
- 367
- 368
- 369
- 370
- 371
- 372
- 373
- 374
- 375
- 376
- 377
- 378
- 379
- 380
- 381
- 382
- 383
- 384
- 385
- 386
- 387
- 388
- 389
- 390
- 391
- 392
- 393
- 394
- 395
- 396
- G Sonntag said that according to the minutes of last meeting, it seemed like city staff wanted across-the-board setbacks in all zones of 10 ft on the side and rear, and 20 ft on the front.
 - G Sonntag felt that this approach lacks proportionality to different lot sizes. He said that a smaller lot with the same setbacks as a large lot doesn't make sense. With smaller lots, people need smaller setbacks in order to fit their house. With larger lots, they want more space around them.
 - J Paulsen asked if the city staff has discussed setbacks further in regards to the Planning Commission's thoughts.
 - S Bankhead said that it was not discussed in executive staff meeting today.
 - S Bankhead said that we are not seeing many people buy larger lots because they want more space. We are actually having more trouble with people fitting their homes on the large lots than on the small lots. People are buying larger lots because they want larger homes. They are also wanting a detached garage, a pool, etc.
 - S Bankhead said that many people ask why they can put a large detached building 5 ft from a property line, but they can't place their house there. She felt that the large detached building does just as much damage to a neighbor.
 - J Paulsen felt that occupied units are different from unoccupied units. He said that if we are allowing accessory dwelling units near the back of the lot, it is essentially like we are subdividing the lot. That is not the vision he wants for Providence, at least not in all zones. That is why he would like separate setbacks for each zone.
 - G Sonntag agreed that there should be a respectable buffer. He asked why people want their accessory dwelling unit so far from their house.
 - S Bankhead said that she personally has a problem with a 10 ft rear yard setback. However, she respects the other members of the executive staff, and their arguments had merit. One reason people have wanted to increase the distance between the accessory dwelling unit and the home is to make the space more usable between the accessory dwelling unit and the home.
 - J Paulsen said that there are many issues that can take place when an occupied unit is too close to a property line, such as noise issues, etc.
 - G Sonntag felt that this bears on the discussion about different lot sizes. A larger lot should have a larger rear setback. Some lots just wouldn't work for an accessory dwelling unit.
 - S Bankhead said that this question is also about the primary dwelling unit. Many people want to utilize their property for a lot of house and less yard. 10,000 square foot homes are not uncommon in Providence.
 - S Bankhead said that staff would like to see a prioritization of the Commission's input. If we understood the Commission's priorities, we could write something that incorporated those.
 - R Holloway had a concern about small sheds that are allowed to be right up against the property line. If a home were built with a 10 ft rear setback, and then someone also put sheds in there, it would be pretty tight. She also said that on the big lots, people build very large garages. They are tall buildings. How much do we want that setback to be?
 - K Alder said that the concept is the same for a small lot or a large lot. People want privacy. If we do a small setback for a small lot, we could be taking away that privacy.
 - R Holloway agreed. She said that space is one of the things that people like about Providence. They like how we have laid out the city.
 - G Sonntag said that maintaining privacy and open space, and the issue of proportionality, is what the commission is focused on. They are concerned with how much of a lot is covered with buildings, and how close buildings are to the neighbor's fence line.
 - K Alder said that the 10 ft setback gives a tool to the city to monitor the setbacks. She felt that it preserves open space.

- 397
- 398
- 399
- 400
- 401
- 402
- 403
- 404
- 405
- 406
- 407
- 408
- 409
- 410
- 411
- 412
- 413
- S Bankhead asked if G Sonntag expressed the priorities of the Commission in regards to crafting a new ordinance.
 - K Alder said no. J Paulsen said that he agreed with G Sonntag’s comment, but felt that we should start by addressing the issue of setbacks for occupied structures. Then we should look at zones, and how they can be used to preserve the character and open space of the city.
 - B Perry agreed that things should be proportional. Setbacks should be smaller on a smaller lot.
 - R Cecil said that he has a 3900 sq ft house in an SFR zone (10,000 sq ft lot size). He has a 25 ft setback in the front and 10 ft on the sides and a large setback in the rear. He feels that building a home on these lots is feasible.
 - G Sonntag said that we will send this ordinance back to staff to have them draft an ordinance.
 - R Holloway asked about the setbacks for outbuildings.
 - S Bankhead said that it is 5 ft unless they are a very small building that doesn’t require a building permit and has no permanent foundation or utilities. Those only need to be far enough that they don’t drip onto the neighbor’s property. There is no limit on the size of an outbuilding except that it can’t take up more than 25% of the yard that they are putting it into. The height limit is 35 ft.

414 **Item No. 6. PCC 10-13 Accessory Dwelling Units:** The Commission will review the current code.

- 415
- The commission decided to take this item off of the agenda in the future.

416

417 **Reports:**

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

419 Skarlet Bankhead, Administrative Services Director:

- 420
- 421
- 422
- 423
- 424
- 425
- 426
- 427
- 428
- 429
- 430
- 431
- 432
- 433
- 434
- 435
- 436
- 437
- 438
- 439
- 440
- 441
- 442
- 443
- 444
- B Perry asked about the Cache Summit.
 - S Bankhead said that it will be at the county event center. The city will pay for it. We will do a group registration.
 - S Bankhead asked who would be participating in the Oktoberkraut parade. B Perry, J Paulsen, and K Alder will come.
 - S Bankhead said that the city council had successful interviews for the city manager position. We had several panels that interviewed the candidates. We brought in 4 applicants.
 - The City Council created a position that will allow us to vote our shares on boards, etc., at water company meetings. Brent Fresz is currently a board member of Blacksmith Fork Irrigation Company. To be on their board, you have to be a shareholder, or an officer or designated representative [of a shareholder]. When Brent Fresz’s city council term ends, he needs this position in order to continue on the board. This volunteer position (Secondary Water Stock Designated Representative) will represent us to all the water companies.
 - The Council discussed the General Plan chapters 7, 8, and 9. Their changes are mostly clarifications. For example, they added language to the effect that all plans should be reviewed and updated at regular intervals. They will discuss chapters 1, 2 and 3 at their next meeting. Their goal is to get through all of the chapters in the next two meetings so that they can adopt the General Plan by their final meeting in December.
 - K Alder suggested having a reception to present the plan to the citizens. S Bankhead said that she thinks that is a great idea.
 - S Bankhead said that once the city manager is hired, she would like to do more outreach, such as setting up more citizen and stakeholder committees.
 - J Paulsen reported on what Max Pierce, City Engineer, discussed at City Council about the sewer system. Sump pumps are a large cost to the city. It also costs a lot to find [sewer infiltration] and fix it.

- 445
- 446
- 447
- 448
- 449
- S Bankhead said that there are some areas of the sewer system that we send cameras to every year. We hire a firm to do 1/3 of the city per year. We found 12 leaky points. We are already working to fix them. We only found two sump pumps. We are also considering a larger effort to reach out to people with sump pumps and educate them about ways that they can keep their basement dry without infiltrating our sewer.
- 450
- R Holloway asked if we have any residences that have septic systems. S Bankhead said that we do. We don't require homes to be on the sewer if all levels of their house would have to be pumped to the sewer. In such a case, the city doesn't want to accept the responsibility of a potential backup to a private home. There are certain water source protection zones in which septic systems cannot be located.
- 451
- 452
- 453
- 454
- 455

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

- 458
- None
- 459

460 **Motion to adjourn:** — R Cecil, second — B Perry

461

462 Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:49 PM

463 Minutes prepared by Jesse Bardsley

464 Minutes approved by vote of the commission on October 23, 2019

465

466

467

468 _____
Gary Sonntag, Chair

468 _____
Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder

469