

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

2 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332

3 September 27, 2017 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 approval of the minutes for September 13,
13 2017.

14
15 Page 4 Line 54: Add a comment specifying that G Sonntag was inquiring about slope stability, not just slopes and
16 grades.

17
18 **Motion to approve the minutes of September 13, 2017 made by B Fresz, seconded by R Cecil.**

19
20 **Vote**

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

22 **Nay:**

23 **Abstained:**

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 No comments. Public Comments Closed.

30
31 Because it was not yet 6:15, the Planning Commission decided to move to Action Item 1.

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

34 **Item No. 1. Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval the final plat for Providence
35 Highlands Subdivision Phase 4, a 12-lot residential subdivision, located at approximately 1170 South 400 East.

36
37 G Sonntag asked if the cul-de-sac on 800 East is where the road currently ends.

38 S Bankhead responded that the cul-de-sac is the temporary turn around, but is where the road will be extended
39 through.

40 S Bankhead reported that Executive Staff has reviewed the final plat application and has it compliant with all City
41 standards, specifications and ordinances. Executive Staff also made the developer aware concerning future phases
42 to the East; they will need to plan for water retention that will come off the mountain. Executive Staff felt that
43 because of where this phase is located they will not need to worry about water retention for storm water.

44 R Holloway asked if it is stated somewhere what the road surface needs to be.

45 S Bankhead responded that road conditions and specifics are not written on the plat, the developer has to comply
46 with city standards, and the construction standards are part of city code, so the specifics don't need to be written
47 on the plat.

48 R James asked if in the future, staff could add any prior conditions on the staff report, so the planning commission
49 is aware of the conditions throughout the process, specifically preliminary through final plat.

50 S Bankhead agreed that staff could make those changes in the future.

51
52 **Motion made to approve the Final Plat for the Providence Highlands Subdivision Phase 4, a 12-lot residential
53 subdivision, made by R Cecil, seconded by J Parker.**

54
55 **Vote**

1 **Yea:** J Parker, R Cecil, B Fresz, R Holloway, R James
2 **Nay:** None

3
4 J Baldwin addressed the Planning Commission to discuss the audio/visual technology updates that will be made to
5 the Council room.

6
7 **Public Hearing(s):**

8 **Hearing No. 1. 6:15:** Prior to making a recommendation on a proposed rezone of Parcel NO. 02-096-0011; a 2.86
9 parcel of property located generally at 100 South 485 West, currently zoned Agricultural (AGR), the Planning
10 Commission is holding a public hearing. The applicant is requesting Multi-Family High Density. The purpose of the
11 public hearing is to provide an opportunity for anyone interested to comment on the proposal before action is
12 taken. The Planning Commission invites you to attend the hearing order to offer your comments. You may also
13 email comments to the City Recorder, sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the day of the meeting.
14

15 **Kent Dunkley** – Represents the owner of the property and a potential buyer of the property. The potential buyers
16 are the Misners that live in Providence, as well as their daughter that lives close by and will be the property
17 manager. The conceptual drawing that was provided is four less homes than what the engineer proposed; the
18 concept plan shows 18 townhomes on the property. The property can fit 22 homes, according to the engineer, but
19 the buyer of the property is fine with having 18 units built instead of 22. There is a deed restriction on 100 South
20 that the road cannot go east, so he had the engineer draw a cul-de-sac, but it could be a hammer head for vehicles
21 to turn around.
22 Concern was shown about emergency vehicles having problems turning around in the cul-de-sac or hammerhead.
23 The property is split into two sections, one section being 2.71 acres and the other 0.16 acres. The concept plan
24 only shows the larger portion of property being built on. The commission inquired what the family plans to do with
25 that property. K Dunkley stated that the smaller portion has been assigned its own tax ID number and is now
26 separate from the larger portion, but when the rezone application was submitted the property had not been split
27 yet, so it was decided that if the rezone is granted the whole 2.86 property would be rezoned, not just the 2.71
28 acre property.
29

30 The public hearing was closed.

31
32 **Hearing No.2. 6:30:** Prior to making a recommendation on a proposed rezone of Parcel No. 02-096-0087; a 4.47
33 parcel of property located generally at 75 South Gateway Drive, currently zone Mixed-Use (MXD), the Planning
34 Commission is holding a public hearing. The applicant is requesting Multi-Family High Density. The purposed of the
35 public hearing is to provide an opportunity for anyone interested to comment on the proposal before action is
36 taken. The Planning Commission invites you to attend the hearing in order to offer your comments. You may also
37 email comments to the City Recorder, sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the day of the meeting.
38

39 S Bankhead reported that she had a pre-construction meeting concerning the access drive relocation. They will be
40 surveying the property and will be moving along with the project.

41
42 The public hearing was closed.

43
44 S Bankhead introduced the new City Attorney, Chad Woolley.

45
46 **Study Item(s):**

47 **Item No.1. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to
48 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, chapter 4 Establishment of Districts by adding Section 6: Multi-
49 Family Medium Density Residential Zone.
50

51 S Bankhead reviewed the staff report. To help the discussion go smoothly the executive staff prepared some
52 questions for the commission to discuss and review. The questions are:

- 53 1. What is the overall goal of the desire to integrate house types? Is it that they be scattered throughout all
54 of Providence?

- 1 2. Should the design guidelines apply to all housing within a life-cycle housing development? Just multi-
2 family?
- 3 Traditionally Providence City hasn't had design standards for single family homes unless they have been
4 part of a planned development.
- 5 3. Should a life-cycle zone be a separate entity from an ordinance regulating design guidelines?
- 6 4. Should there be caps as to the percentage of any one housing type within a life-cycle project?
- 7

8 B Fresz expressed that he liked where the draft is going with the design standards but he felt that a lot of detailed
9 evaluation needs to still be done.

10 R Holloway suggested having the draft available to each commissioner on a Word file so they could make changes
11 in a different color for everyone to see.

12 R James wanted to focus on the bigger picture of this project and work on answering the questions above. He
13 asked what the Commissioners' thoughts were about the first question: "What is the overall goal of the desire to
14 integrate house types? Is it that they be scattered throughout all of Providence?"

15 R Cecil discussed the fieldtrip the Commission and Council went on to view different housing types around the
16 valley. He felt that small multi-family units throughout the city would be fine. Multiple commissioners agreed.

17 R James asked what size of lots the commission would like to see use this zone, would large lots of 20-30 acres or
18 small lots of 1-2 acres for this zone be more preferred.

19 R Holloway felt that if there were better design standards for small lots, then the neighbors and the city would feel
20 better about rezoning a property to the life cycle zone.

21 J Parker discussed the development he lives in, Cobblestone. It has 2 sections of townhomes that have different
22 designs. He feels that the different styles work well as does the development.

23 R James asked if this new zone could be applied to smaller lots within an existing subdivision.

24 S Bankhead said that potentially this zone could be integrated within existing subdivisions. She also discussed the
25 possibility of reviewing and changing the use chart to allow a certain percentage of multi-family units within a
26 single family zone. The design standards would need to be finished before that change could be made.

27 R James asked a clarifying question, should the commission be considering integrating established neighborhoods
28 or creating new integrated neighborhoods where this new zone could be in effect.

29 All commissioners agreed that both options should be considered.

30 R Cecil discussed the possibility of older homes needing to be demolished and having townhomes or some sort of
31 multi-family units on the lot.

32 R Holloway asked a question concerning the input or protection that a homeowner would have if a multi-family
33 unit was proposed on a lot near theirs.

34 R James stated that the homeowners would have the same protection they currently have, which would be a
35 public hearing for the Planning Commission.

36 Councilman Baldwin discussed the possibility of multi-family units being built in among single-family homes. As an
37 example he pointed out the Little Baldy subdivision, each lot is fairly large some being multiple acres. If the
38 Commission decides to allow a certain percentage of multi-family units as part of the integration of this zone into
39 single family zones, the Commission needs to think about the people that have bought land in a single family zone
40 expecting that only single family homes will be built there.

41 R James brought up the protection that the City already has in place for home owners that R Holloway discussed
42 earlier.

43 S Bankhead stated that people can't put all their faith in zones allowing or not allowing certain things. People will
44 need to accommodate for change. She also discussed the downtown area of Providence. If zoning changes are not
45 made the downtown area will continue to crumble. This zoning change could invigorate the downtown area and
46 allow for the changes that need to be made to revitalize the downtown area.

47 R Holloway asked if the code was amended to allow for a multi-family unit in an existing neighborhood and
48 someone wanted to build a multi-family unit on a lot, would the neighbors of the lot be notified.

49 S Bankhead stated that how the code currently reads, the neighbors of the lot would be not be notified by
50 Providence City. If the lot was rezoned then the neighbors would have to be notified, but if the LCR (Life Cycle
51 Residential) code amendment passes then, as long as the units design standards met Providence City's design
52 standards, then the neighbors would not be notified of the change.

53 R Cecil discussed the street he grew up on in California, there were only single family homes, and then a duplex
54 was built but you could tell it was a duplex. He felt like that could be done in Providence and everyone would be
55 happy with it and how it looks.

1 R James discussed the second and third questions concerning design standards, whether or not they should be a
2 separate document than the zone documents.
3 The Commission discussed that yes, the design standards for the LCR zone would need to be a separate document
4 that could be referred to throughout City Code. They also discussed that the LCR design standards would apply to
5 all life-cycle housing.
6 R James moved onto the last question concerning limiting or capping the percentage of any one housing type
7 within a life-cycle project.
8 R Holloway asked for clarification concerning the different types of life-cycle housing.
9 R James stated that there are four kinds of housing that would be allowed within the life-cycle zone, they are:
10 single family detached, townhome, duplex and apartments. For example, single family homes couldn't take up
11 more than 40% of the lot area, or having a lot of high density apartments and having three homes. He felt that
12 caps would be necessary in a zone like this; otherwise, people will take advantage of the zone.
13 B Fresz felt that a minimum and a maximum percentage for each type of housing should be included. He also
14 discussed the possibility of having a conditional approval for certain types of housing in certain areas. For example
15 if they wanted to only allow townhomes, instead of apartments on the east side of the city on the hill.
16 G Sonntag discussed the idea of implementing this new zone for new developments only, and not allowing this
17 new zone to integrate within single family zones right away. That way the new zone will be received better and
18 allowing people to get used to the idea of mixing single family and multi-family units. And then a few years down
19 the road allowing the LCR zone to be integrated into existing developments once people are used to and
20 comfortable with the new zone.
21 B Fresz asked why if so many people want multi-family dwellings, why wouldn't the City change any agriculture
22 land to this LCR zone.
23 R James stated that if all agriculture land was changed to LCR, it would restrict a developer from building just single
24 family homes.
25 R James reviewed the reactions that were expressed in the meeting, he felt there was a lot of support for a zone
26 like LCR but there are some concerns as well.
27

28 **Reports:**

29 **Staff Reports:** Any items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as informational only.
30

31 S Bankhead – The Oktoberkraut Parade is on October 7th at 10 am. How many of the Commissioners would like to
32 be in the parade? She needs to know how many to plan for.
33

34 **Commission Reports:** Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no
35 formal action will be taken.
36

37 **Motion to close meeting of September 27, 2017 made by R Cecil, seconded by J Parker.**
38

39 **Vote**

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

41 **Nay:** None
42

43 Prepared by K Soelberg.
44

45 **APPROVED 10/11/2017**
46

47 _____
Robert James, Chair

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder