

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332
3 January 24, 2018 6:00 p.m.

4
5 **ATTENDANCE**

6 **Chair:** R James, Chairman
7 **Commissioners:** J Parker, R Cecil, B Fresz, R Holloway
8 **Alternates:** R Perry, Gary Sonntag
9 **Absent:** None

10
11 **Approval of the Minutes:**

12 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of January 10, 2018.

13
14 **Motion to approve the minutes of January 10, 2018 made by R Cecil , seconded by G Sonntag.**

15
16 **Corrections:**

17 Page 3 line 29: Change “come up” to “coming up”
18 Page 3 line 50: Add “a” before different

19
20 **Vote**

21 **Yea:** J Parker, R Cecil, B Fresz, R Holloway
22 **Nay:** None
23 **Abstained:** R James

24
25 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the Planning Commission to express their views on issues within
26 the City’s jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Commission. Remarks are limited to 3 minutes per
27 person. The total time allotted to public comment is 15 minutes.

28
29 None

30
31 **Public Hearing(s):** None

32
33 **Action Item(s):** None

34
35 **Study Item(s):**

36 **Item No.1. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
37 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 4 Establishment of Districts by adding Section 6: Life
38 Cycle Residential zone.

39
40 Shari Phippen – Reported that she was not able to work on detailing out why things are the way they are for this
41 code. She did discuss the first attempt at creating a column for the Life Cycle Residential (LCR) zone within the use
42 chart. She stated that she looked at each use and reviewed the goals of the LCR zone and if she felt it was
43 appropriate than she allowed for that use in the zone and also considered possible conditional uses.

44 B Fresz asked S Phippen what a Planned Unit Development (PUD) is.

45 S Phippen responded that a PUD is different in all cities, and she wasn’t sure what the definition of a PUD is for
46 Providence. Generally a PUD is when a master plan is made for a specific area, generally developers are granted a
47 higher density than a zone would normally allow for, because they offer amenities to city that the entire city can
48 benefit from. Such amenities could be: park, splash pad, basketball courts etc. Shari noted that the community of
49 Daybreak is a really large PUD

50 S Bankhead discussed the specific details of what Providence City allows as a PUD.

51 G Sonntag asked whether or not chickens/roosters are allowed in Providence?

52 S Bankhead stated that chickens and roosters are allowed. They have dealt with complaints and the City Council
53 has concerned many times whether or not to change the City Code to not allow roosters. Every time they review
54 the ordinance they decide not to change it. The city has dealt with complaints about roosters via the city code
55 concerning Nuisances.

1 B Fresz asked S Phippen why PUD's shouldn't be allowed in the LCR zone.
2 S Phippen believed that because a PUD would generally require higher density housing than what is already
3 planned for in the LCR zone. She would like to see the LCR zone preserved for a mix of housing types in what is
4 already high density housing. She also noted that PUD's are generally located where the base density is half an
5 acre or more.
6 S Bankhead asked why multi-family apartments aren't allowed according to the proposed use chart.
7 S Phippen stated that was a mistake, multi-family units are allowed in the LCR zone.
8 B Fresz recommended that a pharmacy be a conditional use within the LCR zone.
9 Discussion ensued concerning what the city is able to regulate when it comes to agriculture uses and what they
10 aren't able to regulate. There was also a discussion concerning animals.
11 It was decided that the LCR zone would match what the rest of the use chart says, and at a later date the
12 Commission will review the use chart.
13 They also discussed whether or not laundry services such as a dry cleaner or Laundromat could be allowed. They
14 discussed permitting a shoe repair shop. They decided to allow a shoe repair shop as a conditional use.
15 G Sonntag discussed the reality of a small convenience store or small shop coming into a relatively small
16 community, in today's world small shops don't stay open very long, he was concerned that the City may be
17 allowing something that isn't a reality anymore.
18 S Phippen responded to G Sonntag's comment by expressing her concern as well, she also noted that the LCR zone
19 doesn't require a certain percentage of commercial space within a community. The city is allowing for someone, if
20 they see the potential for a profit, to do so.
21 R Holloway discussed that as communities change so do that businesses around them.
22 Mayor Drew discussed some of the reasons why the Island Market has been able to stay in business, is because it is
23 a convenience store. The people that shop there, shop there not because the prices are the best, but because it is
24 convenient and they're usually only buying a few things at a time.
25 B Fresz noted that most of the areas the Commission has tagged for the LCR zone are on the bench of Providence.
26 He agreed that no commercial space should be required as part of the LCR zone, but he also doesn't want to
27 restrict the possibility for commercial space as part of the LCR zone. He also had a question concerning fitness
28 centers.
29 The Commission, S Phippen and S Bankhead discussed the possibility of allowing a small fitness center within the
30 LCR zone. Multiple commissioners and S Bankhead felt that a small fitness center should be allowed as a
31 conditional use. They decided to list a fitness center as a conditional use. They also discussed adding in the
32 definitions, a maximum square footage or footprint for this type of business.
33 R Cecil asked about a small computer repair shop.
34 S Phippen felt that you have to draw a line somewhere when it comes to having commercial space where there is
35 residential space. She felt that in this zone, the type of commercial space should be used for daily convenience,
36 such as a small convenience store or fitness center, but not a computer repair shop.
37 B Fresz agreed with S Phippen concerning the computer repair shop.
38 S Bankhead felt that when it comes to deciding what kinds of businesses should be allowed in the LCR zone, she
39 recommended looking at the impact a store/shop would have on the neighborhood instead of trying to decide
40 what will be allowed and what won't be.
41 As the Commission and Staff discussed how to go about re-writing the Land Use Chart they discussed how to
42 implement the LCR zone while the Use Chart is being worked on.
43 R James had the idea that since the LCR zone is a mix of zones, if they referenced density per the land use chart,
44 for example with 4 units an acre they would reference the SFT zone, that way they aren't adding more to the use
45 chart and that way the LCR zone is able to match what goes on in the rest of the city.
46 Discussion ensued as to how density would be decided. Some people thought density should be determined by the
47 phase the space is in. Some people thought that density should be determined by where the space is located and
48 what is immediately surrounding the space. The commission decided to continue by having the density be
49 determined by the immediate space around the lot.
50 R James asked the commission if they feel the code is ready for public comment or not?
51 They decided to have a public hearing at the next meeting.
52
53 **Item No.2. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
54 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations and Parking Requirements by adding
55 Section 9 Design Standards for Residential Development.

1
2 S Phippen discussed the best approach for creating these design standards. She felt like it is easier to create design
3 standards that encourage what the City would like to see, instead of creating a list of things that aren't allowed.
4 She also discussed the difficulty of enforcing and legality of being able to restrict certain design standards because
5 certain people don't like specific design standards.
6 B Fresz asked the Council members if they are still in favor of a design guide.
7 J Baldwin, City Council, felt that it is not beneficial to have a very detailed guide, he would like to see a short
8 document for design standards and to only have stated what few things the City doesn't want to see (if they can
9 legally do so).
10 R James rephrased B Fresz's question. Is the Council still interested in seeing a design guide for the LCR zone, or are
11 they not interested in a design guide. If the Council still wants a design guide, than they can decide how to go
12 about it, but R James wanted to know if the Council wants a design guide.
13 J Baldwin reaffirmed that the Council does want to see design standards for the LCR zone. He feels like the
14 direction that has gone for the design standards is too specific and detailed.
15 Mayor Drew asked if it would be helpful if the Council looked at the design standards as a discussion item at their
16 next meeting to give their input to help the Commission decide which way to go with the design standards.
17 R James and multiple commissioners felt that would be helpful.
18 J Baldwin expressed the opinion that he isn't against townhomes, he felt that it would be helpful to include
19 pictures and visual representations of what the City wants to see the townhomes look like to help people have a
20 better understanding of what the City would like to see and what they don't want to see. He also felt that it is
21 important for when a property is rezoned to have a written commitment from the developer that will state what
22 they say they are going to do is actually what the finished product will be. This will help protect the City from low
23 budget developers that will make a mess.
24 S Phippen stated that there are some Cities in the state that require a preliminary development agreement in
25 association with the rezone.
26 J Baldwin stated that he felt that would be a good idea to have a development agreement before building begins.
27 R James asked if the Commission is finished discussing the Design Standards, and what the next step is for the code
28 and design standards.
29 S Bankhead stated that the next step for the design standards and general is the joint workshop with the Planning
30 Commission, City Council and City Staff to discuss the design standards and general plan. The workshop will be
31 held on February 6, 2018 at 7 pm.
32

33 **General Plan Discussion:**

34 **B Fresz**

35 Chapter 5 Goal – Proposed to change to “Direct future growth in Providence in a fiscally and environmentally
36 resilient manner that fosters a sense of community.” Instead of “Direct future growth in Providence in a fiscally
37 and environmentally resilient manner that is consistent with the existing visual character of the town.”

38 -B Fresz asked what the visual character of Providence is. He felt that because there isn't one type of
39 “character” in Providence it would be better to have something that would bring the City together.

40 Chapter 6 Goal – “Provide a safe, efficient, and comprehensive multi-modal transportation system that connects
41 and serves all residents and provides them with access within the City and to the larger region.”

42 -B Fresz felt that this goal was well done and didn't need any changes.

43 Chapter 7 Goal – “Planning housing opportunities for all people, regardless of income level, while maintaining the
44 aesthetic qualities and public service levels Providence residents currently enjoy.”

45 -R Cecil proposed after “income level” to add “race”. He also proposed adding “expect to enjoy” after
46 “currently enjoy”.

47 -B Fresz brought attention to the part of the sentence reading “public service levels Providence residents
48 currently enjoy”, because he felt like Providence residents don't enjoy their roads.

49 -It was discussed taking out “public service levels”. They also discussed not including “race” after income
50 level. Multiple people felt it wasn't right.

51 -The proposed goal “Planning housing opportunities for all people, regardless of income level, while
52 maintaining the aesthetic qualities.” It was discussed the difficulty of determining exactly what to say
53 because aesthetic quality is in the eye of the beholder, everyone has different opinions, so how do they
54 define aesthetic qualities.
55

1 Chapter 8 Goal – “Make city decisions that protect environmental resources such as open space, water quality, and
2 wildlife habitat.”

3 -B Fresz felt that there should be a comment concerning minimizing impact. He also asked that because of
4 the deer population and problems, if the City is concerned about wildlife habitat.

5 -S Bankhead discussed one of the objectives that states “Retain the views of open space” she is sensitive
6 to trying to maintain the “view of open space” because she has had many people call her because they
7 want to “retain their view”. She pointed out that it is difficult to maintain views.

8 -“Make city decisions to protect environmental resources such as open space, air and water quality and
9 wildlife.”

10 Chapter 9 Goal – “Manage public services – water, sewer, annexation, parks and recreation facilities – in a manner
11 that meets the needs of city residents now without compromising the ability to meet future needs.”

12 -B Fresz questioned whether annexation is a public service. He also broke it down into culinary water,
13 secondary water and storm water.

14 -R James asked if the public services need to be broken down and listed individually.

15 -“Manage public services in a manner that meets the needs of city residents now without compromising
16 the ability to meet future needs.”

17 Chapter 5 Objectives –

18 -B Fresz felt that the first three were fine. He questioned the need for the rest of the objectives except for
19 the one concerning design standards. He also felt that it would be a good idea to have an objective
20 concerning the LCR zone, or some kind of mixed residential space because of all the time they have spent
21 on it.

22 -The fourth objective was discussed that it should be shorter and more easily understood.

23 -B Fresz also asked about the importance of preserving historic assets.

24 -Mayor Drew stated that it important to preserve the history of the City.

25 -B Fresz understood the importance of preserving the history of the City, but wonders if that objective
26 was in the chapter, because this chapter is about land use and neighborhoods, so the historic assets
27 would be older homes, which conflicts with the infill strategy the City has been using.

28 -R James stated that it would be good to have a section for preservation would combine historic and
29 environmental.

30 -R James rewrote the fourth objective to be “Promote development patterns that encourage open spaces
31 and preserve natural spaces as part of the residential subdivision process.”

32 Chapter 6 Objectives –

33 -B Fresz asked if having an objective to identify future transportation corridors is necessary, because the
34 City already has a transportation corridor.

35 -It was discussed that it is a good idea to mention that the City has a transportation corridor that needs to
36 be maintained.

37 -B Fresz felt that if they were going to do that to move it down to a strategy.

38 -“Maintain the up-to-date with neighbors the transportation corridor”

39 -B Fresz mentioned that he struggled with the objective dealing with minimizing negative impacts to
40 existing neighborhoods or commercial development along a transportation corridor.

41 -S Bankhead asked if the commission members reviewed the “Best Practices” section of the general plan
42 document. Some of their questions might be answered in that section. She didn’t want to forget that
43 section, or if they’re not going to utilize that section to take it out.

44 -B Fresz felt that it would be wise to add an objective concerning multi-modal transportation, even though
45 it is scattered throughout the document and part of the goal.

46 Chapter 7 Objectives –

47 -There are no objectives for this chapter. There are principles that are listed for this chapter. This
48 document needs to be consistent all the way through. B Fresz felt that the principles were supposed to be
49 the objectives.

50 -B Fresz adapted the first objective to read “Provide opportunities to develop moderate income housing
51 by utilizing high density zones”.

52 -B Fresz also had a problem with how the state code is spelled out in the general plan, he would like to
53 see the code referenced not written out entirely.

1 -S Bankhead stated that she believes that who wrote up the general plan took this section straight from
2 the City Plan, which is why there are not objectives or strategies. It also hasn't been a part of the City's
3 plan to have more moderate income housing.
4 -R James agreed with B Fresz that he doesn't want the state code written out as part of the general plan,
5 he just wants the code referenced.
6 -B Fresz felt that the last two principles listed weren't necessary. He expressed again that he would like to
7 see the General Plan be formatted the same way throughout the document.

8 Chapter 8 Objectives –

9 -B Fresz discussed the first objective and recognized that the City needs to decide what it's goals are.
10 -B Fresz felt that on the third objective the word "views" needs to be removed.
11 -The last objective concerning managing deer and small animal populations. B Fresz felt that was a can of
12 worms and needed to be discussed.
13 -R James reminded everyone that managing the deer could mean keeping the deer out. The objective is
14 trying to maintain some level of control, whatever that level of control needs to be.
15 -R James would like to add an objective for air quality.
16 -R James asked if they have anything that encourages the health of the citizens.
17 -S Bankhead responded that having a city that is walk-able their encouraging health among citizens. She
18 also discussed the resources that are listed, the resources need to match and be incorporated into the
19 strategies, if they decide they want the resources part of the General Plan. The Council needs to decide
20 what they will support.

21 Chapter 9 Objectives –

22 -On the first objective, B Fresz, would like to change "clean water" to "culinary water"
23 -S Bankhead responded that keeping the objective to say clean water, covers all types of water such as
24 culinary and storm water.
25 -B Fresz would like to separate out the objectives for culinary water and storm water, because the water
26 is treated differently.
27 -B Fresz felt that an objective needed to be added concerning reducing the loads on storm water, sewer
28 and culinary water supply. A strategy that could be part of that objective would be to not have sump
29 pumps dump into the sewer system.
30 -B Fresz also didn't see any objections dealing with conservation or reduction of costs for the city.
31 -S Bankhead discussed the possibility of having a time frame listed in the general plan to have objectives
32 and strategies be accomplished by.

33 B Fresz also noted that California has come up with the "State of California 2017 General Plan Guidelines". It is a
34 pretty good lesson learned and best practices reference guide. He found it to be helpful and recommended that
35 everyone look at it.

36
37 **Reports:**

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

39
40 S Bankhead – The City Council approved the purchase of some property where they are considering putting the
41 reservoir. The workshop on February 6, 2018 at 7 pm.

42
43 Commission Reports: Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no
44 formal action will be taken.

45
46 **Motion to close meeting of January 24, 2018 made by R Cecil, seconded by J Parker.**

47
48 **Vote**

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

50 **Nay:** None

51
52 Prepared by K Soelberg.