

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES**

3 **Providence City Office Building**
4 **15 South Main, Providence, UT**
5 **September 12, 2006, 5:30 p.m.**

6 **Attendance:** Chair: Blaine Sorensen
7 Commissioners: B Bagley, Jon Mock, L Campbell
8 Skarlet Bankhead – City Administrator, Becky Turley – Staff Support
9

10 **The Providence City Planning Commission will hold a meeting/public hearing to discuss the**
11 **items listed below. Anyone interested is invited to attend.**

12
13 **Study Items: No study items.**

14 **Action Items: No action items.**

15
16 B Sorensen explained that the Planning and Zoning Meeting had been changed from September
17 5, 2006, to this evening, September 12, 2006, due to a clerical error in the posted agenda.
18

19 B Sorensen noted that Danny McFarland has withdrawn his request for inner block development
20 on 100 East 200 South. There will be no public hearing on that topic tonight. If there are
21 concerns, plan to attend the next City Council Meeting.
22

23 **Minutes.** Page 8 line 6 should read quarry road, not prairie road.
24 Page 3 line 12, the input from Kathy Baker is different from the Historic
25 Preservation Committee.
26 Page 5 of 12, J Mock asked who made statement between Dan Hogan’s
27 statements—unsure
28 Page 6 of 12, line 21, 3.5 feet off the ground.
29 Page 6 line 43 should read, the children do get bussed.

30 Motion to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on August 15, 2006,
31 with the above stated correction – Jon Mock, second – B Bagley
32

33 **Vote:** **Yea:** B Bagley, L Campbell, J Mock
34 **Nay:** None
35 **Abstained:** None
36 **Excused:** J Beazer
37

38 **Disclosure of any conflict of interest on any of the agenda items.** None
39

40 **Disclosure of any ex parte communication on any of the agenda items.**

41 T Rasmussen has spoken with residents who live around the Cove Subdivision. J Mock met with
42 the Carlsens while looking at where subdivision will be if it is approved.
43

44 **Public Hearings:**

45 **5:40 p.m.** **The Providence City Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to**
46 **receive comment on a proposed inner block residential development**
47 **located generally at 100 South 200 East (amended 9/08/2006).**

48 Withdrawn
49
50
51

1 **Items for Recommendation:**

2 **Item No. 1. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for recommendation a**
3 **request from America First Credit Union for a site plan on lot 108 in the Alder Square**
4 **Commercial Subdivision located at 544 West 100 North.**

- 5 • Jon Mock asked where it will be on the Alder Square.
- 6 • B Sorensen would like to present it at the next meeting on September 19, 2006.

7 Motion to grant a request from America First Credit Union for a site plan on lot 108 in the
8 Alder Square Commercial Subdivision located at 544 West 100 North be moved to the next
9 Planning and Zoning Meeting with the recommendation to make the staff report, DRC
10 reports, recommendations and conditions, and any other information that may be useful in
11 making a decision available – B Bagley, second – J Mock

12 Vote: Yea: All in Favor

13

14 **Item No 2. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for recommendation a**
15 **request by Dan Hogan for approval of a preliminary plat for The Cove; a residential**
16 **subdivision containing 26 lots, located generally at 691 Grandview Drive.**

- 17 • B Sorensen stated that Max Pierce is here to answer any questions. This recommendation
18 is to consider the approval or disapproval of this subdivision. There were numerous
19 concerns previous commissioners had with this plan. Other conditions were listed, the
20 council has matched the conditions with the minutes, and it appears that everything is in
21 order.
- 22 • B Bagley wonders if the information is new and approved or old and not approved
23 because of the differences in information as well as the utilities signatures. He stated that
24 he reviewed the plans to see if the names were there as well as the submitter's names and
25 he commented that it was hard to tell. He also mentioned that it is hard to tell the widths
26 of the roads that come onto Canyon Road.
- 27 • L Campbell said that some road widths are listed.
- 28 • B Sorensen asked Skarlet for clarification on why there are two preliminary plats and
29 why the information is different.
- 30 • S Bankhead answered that the first plat has information on it that is not concrete, and the
31 second plat enhances the first plat with concrete information. We then use it with the
32 utilities acknowledgement. By adding everything within 200 feet, it meets our ordinance,
33 but did not change the subdivision itself. It does not affect the utilities
- 34 • B Sorensen stated that the advice or input given in the past is because of the public
35 utilities signature on the first one and the surveyor's certificate, but not on the second, the
36 fact is that it is not contradictory.
- 37 • S Bankhead stated that we can ask Scott Wyatt, but that is how it has been treated it in the
38 past.
- 39 • B Sorensen asked Scott Wyatt if the second is a supplemental to the first and can be
40 treated as one item.
- 41 • S Wyatt said yes.
- 42 • S Bankhead stated that the information in the packet is the same as the information in the
43 August 21, 2006 packet.
- 44 • L Campbell clarified that he was looking on the second page redone with the 200 feet.
- 45 • B Bagley commented that he has the one listed on the 21st of August, but not on the one
46 that shows the boundaries.
- 47 • S Bankhead stated that we do not have a copy of the utility company signatures on the
48 one with the 200 ft boundaries. We do have a copy of the utility signatures dated August
49 21st on the preliminary plat without the 200 foot boundaries. The title report is included.

- 1 • Dan Hogan stated that he hand delivered the utility report personally and they have been
- 2 turned in.
- 3 • B Bagley asked why the City Engineer does not sign off on preliminary plats.
- 4 • S Bankhead said that he made comment, but there are conditions associated with this plat,
- 5 and you have the opportunity to add conditions if we miss something. But if you approve
- 6 the plat with those conditions, we have the developer bring in a correct plat meeting all
- 7 the conditions unless there are conditions that are actually going to be followed up on
- 8 construction drawings. We make note of those and follow up on those with construction
- 9 drawings. At the time after you have approved it and listed your conditions, the
- 10 developer makes a new plat showing all of those conditions, and then the City Engineer
- 11 approves it. The City Engineer does not approve a plat that is not approved by the City
- 12 Council and the Planning Commission.
- 13 • B Sorensen asked if that is how it has been approved historically.
- 14 • S Bankhead said it is because the City Engineer cannot approve it before the Planning
- 15 Commission makes their recommendations or before the City Council makes their
- 16 recommendations. They may add additional conditions.
- 17 • B Bagley asked how we know that the grade it right and that it has been surveyed right.
- 18 • S Bankhead said that is why Max is here.
- 19 • B Bagley asked if we need a signature, or do we just talk. Does he have to give us a
- 20 letter saying that he has surveyed it and that it is this grade and it meets the code.
- 21 • S Bankhead stated that the City does not resurvey.
- 22 • B Bagley stated that Max should know if it is a safety condition.
- 23 • Max said it is because of the DRC committee who gives comments.
- 24 • B Bagley asked that if an accident occurred on that intersection, have we approved that
- 25 because the accident happened because of the grade coming off of there.
- 26 • Max said this is not an issue to be on the preliminary plat. It is so we can be thinking
- 27 what the grade will look like. Nothing should be commented on technically from the
- 28 ordinance. It is not approved yet.
- 29 • J Mock is concerned about the grade, also, and has trouble approving something like that.
- 30 • Max suggested that is why he wanted the profile to see how to approach it, and said that
- 31 he is okay with the preliminary design. He agreed with the safety concern, but stated that
- 32 it is not in the ordinance.
- 33 • J Mock he does not want to set up a dangerous situation for the whole community with
- 34 just one road with difficult access getting into and out of. He is more concerned about
- 35 the intersection and how fast traffic can be coming down. It is a short area for someone
- 36 to stop, he stated.
- 37 • L Campbell asked about signing with improvements that need to be made. He has looked
- 38 at where the subdivision goes and he has traveled through there several times, but has not
- 39 seen a huge major concern to change his mind. There are two dozen other streets in this
- 40 city which are just as dangerous.
- 41 • B Bagley thinks that the subdivision it is an unsafe situation. Turning left is an accident
- 42 waiting to happen. Kids waiting for the bus could be unsafe. The Traffic Engineer
- 43 would have a question mark about safety. Canyon Road is not wide enough to handle
- 44 more traffic. He commented on how Dan Hogan addressed improvements in the city and
- 45 how other subdivisions do not have the same requirements. He stated that he has not
- 46 seen a lot of improvements on Canyon Road and the intersection on 300 East. He said
- 47 we have a very dangerous situation that needs to be improved upon. In later years, we
- 48 can see changes. We will be hearing more about developments going in. Some will
- 49 impact Canyon Road directly. He sees very little traffic going south. Many of the other
- 50 subdivisions will bleed off and come onto Canyon Road. The road should be 60-65 feet

1 wide. Efforts have been made to get property owners to give the City easements and said
2 he does not know what progress has been made on that subject. He said lets get on with
3 it and get ready for our growth. He mentioned the growth that has begun and probably
4 will begin to the east and south of Canyon Road. Unjustified, unbalanced, Canyon Road
5 is not prepared to handle more traffic. We have got to do something, he indicated. Dan
6 indicated that the price of housing has gone up, but we should not let these things
7 pertaining to growth happen until we are prepared. We are to be planners. We should
8 not be pushed with these decisions. He stated that he does not have an answer for
9 Canyon Road. Some places have 22-24 feet concrete across the road from shoulder to
10 shoulder. He also commented that he has almost been hit when walking on Canyon
11 Road. What are we as the City going to do about it, he asked. His suggestion would be
12 to let development happen with safety, health, and welfare of the citizens. We have been
13 appointed to preserve and protect their rights, he stated. Maybe we should get the
14 developer, the City Council Member in charge of roads, the Public Works Director and
15 the citizens together to approach the land owners to see what we can do. If we cannot get
16 the land necessary to widen the road, we should not impact that road. In hindsight we are
17 trying to make these plans. Canyon Road needs to be addressed. We could say no more
18 development until we get this done, or we could approve the development with the
19 conditions that no building lots can be sold, no permits can be issued until Canyon Road
20 is improved.

- 21 • J Mock asked if anyone had considered adding sidewalks.
- 22 • S Bankhead said no. A few years back it was a special improvement area and we tried to
23 get more than what we got, he stated, but the citizens in that area insisted they did not
24 want sidewalks.
- 25 • B Sorensen stated that this is his second term on the planning commission and probably
26 will be his last. He stated that he never considered himself to buckle to developers. He
27 added that this hope is that what is done this evening is knowing that it is done with
28 intense scrutiny on this particular proposal, this setting a particular standard and must be
29 implemented on any other standard or viewed as a slap at Dan specifically as to what Dan
30 is trying to do. If other individuals are approved and do not have to meet these
31 conditions, then he does not know what to say. He stated that he senses a feeling that for
32 some reason he does not believe the people who say they are not against growth are for
33 growth, and they are trying to latch on to grasping items to try to stall what is a good
34 project. He also stated that he cannot vote unless there is a tie. He asked for someone to
35 make a motion.

36 Motion to approve the recommendation from the staff request by Dan Hogan for approval of
37 preliminary plat for the Cove, a residential subdivision containing 26 lots, located generally
38 on 692 Grandview Drive – L Campbell no recommendation to second.

- 39 • Rand Henderson said you understand this is not dead and someone can give an
40 alternative motion.
- 41 • B Sorenson said that the chair only votes in case of a tie. It goes to the Council
42 without a recommendation.

43
44 Meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

45 Minutes taken and prepared by Becky Turley

46
47
48
49
50 _____
Blaine Sorensen, Chair

Becky Turley, Office Assistant