

1 Providence City Planning Commission
2 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332
3 February 28, 2018 6:00 p.m.

4
5 **Call to Order:** Brent Fresz, Acting Chair
6 Attendance: Rowan Cecil, John Parker, Gary Sonntag
7 Excused: Ruth Ann Holloway, Robert James, Robert Perry

8
9 **Approval of the Minutes:**

10 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for February 6, 2018.

11 Corrections: None

12 **Motion to approve the minutes for February 6, 2018 – R Cecil, second G Sonntag**

13 **Vote:**

14 **Yea:** R Cecil, B Fresz, J Parker, G Sonntag

15 **Nay:** None

16 **Abstained:** None

17 **Excused:** R Holloway, R James, R Perry

18
19 **Item No. 2.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for February 15, 2018.

20 Corrections: None

21 **Motion to approve the minutes for February 15, 2018 – J Parker, second R Cecil**

22 **Vote:**

23 **Yea:** R Cecil, B Fresz, J Parker, G Sonntag

24 **Nay:** None

25 **Abstained:** None

26 **Excused:** R Holloway, R James, R Perry

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

- 31 • No comments from the public

32 **Public Hearing(s):** None

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

35
36 **Study Items(s):**

37 **Item No. 1. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
38 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 4 Establishment of Districts by adding Section 6: Life
39 Cycle Residential zone. (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes.)

- 40 • S Phippen explained the proposed changes. In the LCR zone, the phases would need to be shown during
41 the rezone process. The setback changes were reviewed.
- 42 • G Sonntag asked about twin homes. Twin homes are on individual lots with a common wall. S Phippen felt
43 twin homes would fall into the duplex. S Phippen discussed adding the definition of duplex.
- 44 • B Fresz asked if "duplex" is defined in the City Code.
- 45 • S Bankhead responded that duplex and twin homes are defined in the city code. She also noted that a
46 twin home would be included as a single family attached dwelling and a duplex would be a multi-family
47 dwelling. She read the definition of single family attached as defined in the city code.
- 48 • It was discussed to change in the LCR zone to read "single family attached" instead of "single family
49 attached (townhome).
- 50 • B Fresz asked about conditional ranges rather than no more than 50%. He felt a mechanism to vary the
51 percentage slightly due to geographical conditions. S Phippen felt some of this would be limited by the
52 density limits. Define the 50% as the total number of dwelling units.
- 53 • Phasing concerns were discussed. There were a lot of concerns expressed by commissioners as well as city
54 staff and developers at the meeting. Some concerns were if a developer started a project and built only
55 multi-family units within the LCR zone and then go out of business before they finish the whole project,

1 whoever ends up with the land after the first developer, would the second developer/bank have to abide
2 by what had already been built during the first phase, meaning that the second developer could only build
3 specific density housing.

- 4 • S Phippen suggested requiring developers building in the LCR zone to have a development agreement at
5 the preliminary phase. Typically a development agreement isn't required until the final plat.
- 6 • B Fresz would still like to see intent or appendices. Even if just saying that a number was chosen because
7 it is a general standard in the building community.
- 8 • J Jackson discussed townhome setbacks. Specifically front and back yard setbacks. If they want to see 20
9 foot driveways than a 20 foot front setback is appropriate, if that's not what the city has in mind than a 20
10 foot front setback is too large. He also had concerns with the rear setback. Typically a "townhome" is just
11 the footprint of the building, and the rear property line is right outside the back door. He felt that the
12 setbacks worked well for single family units as well as single family attached but for townhomes and
13 apartments these setbacks needed to be addressed.
- 14 • S Bankhead discussed problems the city wanted to avoid when decided setbacks. She also discussed the
15 possibility of adding public utility easements, not for the typical reason, but it might be a good idea to add
16 something about public utility easements. It was discussed to have a 10 foot driveway, it would need to
17 be written that parking wouldn't be allowed on the driveway. The 10 foot driveway is a way to get access
18 into the garage not to park on.
- 19 • Sharell Eames was alarmed at the conversation with the developer. B Fresz informed Mrs. Eames that the
20 Commission isn't discussing a specific development with Jeff Jackson, they are using his, as a developer, to
21 get information they otherwise would not be privy to.
- 22 • J Jackson discussed side elevations and roofs and "unless architectural style". He felt that not allowing
23 anything but a 6-12 roof pitch eliminates a lot of design styles.
- 24 • Parking was discussed. J Jackson felt that half a guest spot per unit was high. The possibility of having
25 0.25-0.5 per unit was discussed. S Phippen said she would do more research. J Jackson asked about having
26 4 spaces per single family unit?
27

28 **Item No. 2. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
29 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations and Parking Requirements by adding
30 Section 9 Design Standards for Residential Development. (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes)

- 31 • G Sonntag suggested showing traffic control and existing utilities. It was explained existing utilities are
32 required on the preliminary plat.
- 33 • S Phippen stated she would add references to the subdivision process in this section of code.
- 34 • Geotech information is required early on in the subdivision process, at the concept plan.
- 35 • G Sonntag suggested changes to street lighting.
- 36 • The approval process for subdivisions was discussed. The approval process will be very similar to the
37 subdivision process in any other zone. Construction documents will be approved by City Staff and the City
38 Engineer, not by the Planning Commission.
- 39 • B Fresz felt the percentage limit on xeriscaping should be removed. S Bankhead recommended adding a
40 statement encouraging L.I.D. when it comes to storm drainage.
- 41 • The garage protrusion was discussed. B Fresz felt that garage protrusion should be allowed, he agreed
42 there should be a limit set, but that garage protrusion should be allowed. S Phippen said she would do
43 some research to find a middle ground.
- 44 • J Baldwin felt a 16' setback was adequate for most vehicles. S Phippen recommended using a percentage
45 of the garage depth to determine the front setback.

46 **Item No. 3. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
47 Providence City Code Title 11 Subdivision Regulations Chapter 4 Design Standards Section 3 Streets and Street
48 Improvements by adding a seal coat on all asphalt surfaces within a subdivision. (Discussion time approximately 10
49 minutes)

- 50 • S Bankhead informed the Commission that all proposed changes and information was added, including
51 the information from the City Attorney. All the concerns changes for bonding and fee in lieu were
52 addressed.
- 53 • G Sonntag discussed having a standard for chip/crack seal, because chip/crack seal can vary greatly.
- 54 • Schedule for public hearing.

- G Sonntag page 1 11-4-1 standards of design shall be provided by the City Engineers, Board of Health. He suggested accepted standards. Change Public Health Department to Utah Dept of Water Quality. APWA standards address the issues of the fire department. Refer to the MUTCD.

Item No. 4. General Plan: The Providence Planning Commission will discuss a draft of the general plan, prepared by CRSA. (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes)

The Planning Commission discussed descriptions for Providence City such as:

- S Bankhead asked if the chart in the re-write of the General Plan is what they were expecting to see and do they feel that the objectives are manageable or are they too ambiguous.
- B Fresz felt that the objectives were as ambiguous as they should be and that all the objectives and goals that he had read were all good.
- B Fresz asked the Mayor and Council members if they felt the most recent copy of the General Plan is ready to turn over to City Staff. J Baldwin felt that it wouldn't be a bad idea to have another workshop. Mayor Drew wants a general plan that applies to Providence and wants to see things included that are doable, actionable and things the City can afford, not things the City would like to do someday.
- B Fresz liked how the strategies were broken down into long term and short term. He was planning on handing over the strategies to City Staff and then come back together. He felt that the City Council and Planning Commission should be concerned about the goals and objectives which will dictate the strategies.
- Mayor Drew recommended having the City Staff have a workshop session to give feedback to the Council and Commission.
- B Fresz reviewed, everyone felt comfortable with the goals and objectives were good and might need only slight tweaking. Recommended having the City Staff look at creating some strategies that go along with the goals and objectives they have created.
- G Sonntag expressed his thoughts, he felt that with all the work that has been done they are moving in the right direction with this document, but he has felt the whole time that the big picture is missing. If they want Providence to have that small town-rural feeling, how are they going to preserve that? What is the big picture they want to create or preserve within Providence?
- Mayor Drew stated that Providence is perceived as a more "up-scale" community throughout the Valley making it more desirable.
- S Bankhead liked a statement made by G Sonntag concerning the variety of creative residential options within Providence. It was discussed that it may be too late to preserve the kind of rural-small town feel they are trying to capture, because of small lots and continued development.
- R Cecil brought up that people like Providence because it is a comfortable city to live in with good people surrounding them.
- Mayor Drew discussed why he moved to the City; he was impressed with how friendly people are and how comfortable the city felt.
- Mayor Drew expressed concern with the lack of affordable housing. Families with an average income would have difficulty purchasing a home in Providence. Who are we as Providence; do we exclude people who can't afford to live here? He wants people to feel welcome.
- Mayor Drew read the following email from Kevin Opshal:
John, I have a question for you for a story I'm running this weekend about the public comment portion of meetings.
Some council members in other cities have told me they find public comment counter productive in the sense that they might not be able to immediately answer a person's question or address their concern. So they've scrapped public comment time at beginning of meetings in favor of having an open door policy, where residents can call or email them.
Providence has had quite a lot of people come up to talk during public comment over the years. Does this reaffirm your belief that public comment is effective or does it make you think that maybe Providence should not have a public comment portion at meetings?
- Mayor Drew replied as follows:
Kevin
I believe public comment is effective and we as a city go out of our way to solicit input from citizens in a number of forums:

1 *We invite comment at the beginning during the public comment section during a council meeting. We*
2 *invite comment when discussing an agenda item. Our Planning Commission does the same. We invite*
3 *comment at the Mayor's Town Hall on the first Saturday of the month from 8 to 10 in the morning. We all*
4 *get emails and phone calls which we welcome as well.*

5 *If we have a question we can't answer, it is my policy and the City's that we get back with an answer*
6 *pronto.*

- 7 • Sharell Eames expressed concern with tonight's discussion. She wants Providence to stay as it is.
- 8 • S Bankhead stated that she felt that Mrs. Eames was misunderstanding the conversation. Providence City
9 as a whole needs to figure out affordable housing options for good, hard working people that the City and
10 County need. If the City wants to be affordable some changes need to be made. She asked the question
11 how does the City balance increase in costs and the quality of services they are used to and still have a
12 place where people can only afford a \$230,000 home.
- 13 • Staff will look at the strategies.

14
15 **Reports:**

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

- 17 • No additional staff reports.

18
19 Commission Reports: Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no
20 formal action will be taken.

- 21 • No additional commission reports.

22
23 **Motion to adjourn – R Cecil, second – J Parker**

24 **Vote:**

25 **Yea:** **R Cecil, B Fresz, J Parker, G Sonntag**

26 **Nay:** **None**

27 **Abstained:** **None**

28 **Excused:** **R Holloway, R James, R Perry**

29
30 Meeting adjourned approximately 8:40 p.m.