

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Meeting**
2 **15 South Main, Providence UT 84332**
3 **November 9, 2016 6:00 p.m.**

4
5 **Attendance**

6 Chair: Robert James
7 Commissioners: Rowan Cecil, Andrea Diamond, Brent Fresz (alternate), Mike Harbin, John Parker
8 Excused: None
9 Absent: None

10
11 Skarlet Bankhead, Administrative Services Director

12
13 **Approval of the Minutes:**

14 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of October 26, 2016.

15
16 Motion made to approve the minutes of October 26, 2016. – R Cecil, second-J Parker.

17 Vote: Yea: R Cecil, A Diamond, M Harbin, J Parker
18 Nay: None
19 Abstained: R James
20 Excused: None

21
22 **Corrections**

- 23 **Pg. 1 changes in attendance- remove R James as excused**
24 **Pg. 3, line 43 change to - are not "to" be.**

25
26 **Action Items:**

27 **Item No. 1. Code Amendment:** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider a recommendation to City
28 Council on a proposal to amend Providence City Code Title 11 Chapter 3 Section 1 Concept Plan and Section 2
29 Preliminary Plat, by adding requirements for the phasing of a subdivision.

30
31 **Motion made to make a recommendation to City Council on a proposal to amend Providence City Code Title 11**
32 **Chapter 3 Section 1 Concept Plan and Section 2 Preliminary Plat, by adding requirements for the phasing of a**
33 **subdivision with the two changes identified.–R Cecil, second-M Harbin.**

34 Vote: Yea: R Cecil, A Diamond, M Harbin, R James, J Parker
35 Nay: None
36 Abstained: None
37 Excused: None

- 38
39
 - R James noted that a public meeting was held on this proposal. No input was received.
 - S Bankhead reviewed the changes made as identified in the Executive Staff Review of October 10, 2016. The amendments clarify the acreage to be included in the legal description of a subdivision plan and the city's intent for phasing public infrastructure, facilities and services in a timely and orderly manner. The changes in the amendment ensure that there are no small remainder parcels that a developer might use as an excuse to not complete infrastructure. A remainder parcel will need to have the area required in a minimum phase. These changes will help ensure the infrastructure required is completed. The area of a remainder parcel will not be less than six lots. The exact acreage per lot is determined by the zone type. A comparison review with North Ogden and Nibley was completed to ensure the phasing requirements proposed were comparable with other city's codes on phasing. Once the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to City Counsel, the proposal will be reviewed again.
 - J Drew expressed concerns over the term "fair share". The wording is vague and he would prefer that it be more specific.
 - S Bankhead explained that proportionate fair share refers to the impact that the development will have on the overall systems. For example, if a development proposal is submitted in an area that does not have road access because it is the development that is creating the need for a road, the requirement for the

1 infrastructure necessary becomes part of their proportionate fair share. In contrast, suppose the city
2 decides an 80 foot right-of way is needed because our master plan anticipates that a road will become a
3 major thoroughfare. The developer's proportionate fair share, as specifications require, is a 66 foot
4 thoroughfare. The city cannot make that developer do more than their proportionate fair share.

- 5 • A Diamond asked if fair share is considered a commonly use term and if Skarlet had any concerns using
6 this terminology.
- 7 • S Bankhead responded that she did not have concerns with it but she will check with the city attorney
8 about it.
- 9 • R Cecil suggested that the word "fair" be removed.
- 10 • R James requested the following changes to remove ambiguity: On page 3, line 11, remove the word "fair"
11 and on page 3, line 22, change to "within".

12
13 **Study Items:**

14 Item No. 1. General Plan Consultant RFP review: The Providence City Planning Commission will review proposals
15 submitted in response to the City's request for proposals from qualified consultants for the 2016 General Plan
16 Update.

- 17 • J Roberts commented that this is an unplanned budget expense and anything we can do to contain the
18 costs would be good.
- 19 • The Planning Commission reviewed the proposals submitted by Landmark, CRSA and KLJ Engineering.
20 These are the firms the Steering Committee recommended. After evaluating each proposal and discussing
21 the pros and cons, strengths and weaknesses of each firm, the decision was made to interview CRSA and
22 KLJ Engineering.
- 23 • The first interview will be scheduled on Thursday, November 17, 2016 between 4:00 and 5:00 p.m.
- 24 • R James will mail interview questions to S. Bankhead.

25
26 **Reports:**

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

28
29 Commission Reports: Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no
30 formal action will be taken.

31
32 Agenda posted by Skarlet Bankhead on November 4, 2016.

33
34 **Motion made to adjourn Planning Commission meeting of November 9, 2016. –R Cecil, second – J Parker**

35 **Vote: Yea: R Cecil, A Diamond, M Harbin, R James, J Parker**
36 **Nay: None**
37 **Abstained: None**
38 **Excused: None**

39
40 Meeting adjourned 5:00 p.m.

41 Minutes prepared by K Merrill.

42
43
44
45
46
47 
Robert James, Chairman

48
49
50
51

Kristine Merrill, Office Specialist