

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332  
3 January 10, 2018 6:00 p.m.

4  
5 **ATTENDANCE**

6 **Chair:** B Fresz  
7 **Commissioners:** J Parker, R Cecil, B Fresz, R Holloway  
8 **Alternates:** R Perry, Gary Sonntag  
9 **Absent:** R James

10  
11 B Fresz led the meeting due to R James absence.

12  
13 **Approval of the Minutes:**

14 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of December 13,  
15 2017.

16  
17 **Motion to approve the minutes of December 13, 2017 made by R Cecil, seconded by G Sonntag.**

18  
19 **Vote**

20 **Yea:** R Cecil, J Parker, R Holloway, B Fresz, G Sonntag  
21 **Nay:** None  
22 **Abstained:** None

23  
24 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the Planning Commission to express their views on issues within  
25 the City's jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Commission. Remarks are limited to 3 minutes per  
26 person. The total time allotted to public comment is 15 minutes.

27  
28 **Mayor Drew-** Discussed the study item concerning the draft of the General Plan; he was disappointed by the draft  
29 and has proposed many changes. He felt the plan needs to be more specific to Providence, and needs to reflect  
30 what the City is actually able to do.

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

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

35 **Item No. 1. Preliminary Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval a preliminary plat for  
36 Providence Hollow Phase 2 Subdivision, a 23-lot residential subdivision located in the general area of 600 East 500  
37 North.

38  
39 Shari Phippen provided a brief background of the property and the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law,  
40 and Conditions:

41 **FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- 42 1. Executive Staff used the Providence City Master Plan 2000 as revised, and also examined current and  
43 anticipated development in the immediately surrounding area, to review the application and determined  
44 that the General Plan calls for this type of development in the area where it is proposed.  
45 2. This property was rezoned from Agricultural to Single Family Traditional in November 2016.  
46 3. Staff further reviewed City Code 10-8 to determine whether the proposed preliminary plat meets the  
47 necessary minimum lot sizes and frontages.  
48 4. All of the proposed building lots meet or exceed the required 95' frontage on a publicly dedicated road  
49 and the required 12,000 square foot minimum lot size.  
50 5. All publicly dedicated roads have been laid out in accordance with the Providence City engineering  
51 standards, specifications and ordinances.

52 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

- 53 1. The applicant has met all necessary requirements that would entitle them to approval of their preliminary  
54 plat.

55

1 **CONDITIONS:**

- 2 1. The applicant shall meet all applicable City, state and federal laws, codes, rules.

3  
4 The applicant submitted the preliminary plat application in December 2017, all suggested changes have been made  
5 and the application has been resubmitted. The property was rezoned to Single Family Traditional in November  
6 2016. City Staff reviewed the application. They [City Staff] agree that the revised general plan calls for this type of  
7 development. All of the proposed building lots meet the City's Standards, as well as all proposed city roads. The  
8 staff recommends to the Planning Commission that they approve the Providence Hollows Phase 2 Subdivision  
9 Preliminary Plat. The only condition is that the applicant shall continue to meet all City, State, and Federal laws and  
10 regulations.

11 G Sonntag asked if a study had or will be done to determine if water pressure will be enough for this development.  
12 Danny MacFarlane spoke to the Commission, concerning water pressure. He stated that extensive studies were  
13 done in this area because of the Little Baldy subdivision that is in the same pressure zone as this proposed  
14 development. He stated that a study has not been done specifically for the Providence Hollow's subdivision, but he  
15 knows that the water pressure in the area will be sufficient for the proposed development.

16 R Cecil inquired about the water meters on lots 16 & 17.

17 Danny reported that they are there so that there will be no utility cuts in the road.

18  
19 **Motion made to approve the Providence Hollows Subdivision Phase 2 Preliminary Plat, made by R Perry,**  
20 **seconded by R Cecil.**

21  
22 **Vote**

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

24 **Nay: None**

25  
26 **Study Item(s):**

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

30  
31 Shari Phippen reviewed changes made since the previous meeting. Because of Mr. Jackson's comments at the last  
32 meeting, and the Planning Commission's agreeability with his comments, she made quite a few changes. Some of  
33 the changes are, not requiring a minimum lot area for townhomes and apartments, rather having a minimum  
34 dwelling unit size. She also changed parking requirements. Mr. Jackson stated at the previous meeting that there  
35 was not enough parking for townhomes or apartments. She reviewed other cities codes and decided that the more  
36 bedrooms an apartment has the more parking spaces should be required.

37 B Fresz asked where they go from here?

38 S Bankhead explained that if the Commission feels good with the code as currently written and have no more  
39 changes, the next step is to have a public hearing to get public input; if there are more changes, then it will stay as  
40 a study item.

41 B Fresz expressed mixed feelings about adding the option of adding a small retail space to the zone.

42 S Bankhead discussed the option to amend the use chart to allow retail space as a conditional use in this zone.

43 S Phippen expressed that she thought the Life Cycle Zone was just for residential purposes.

44 S Bankhead responded that was the assumption while creating the zone, but in the last few meetings, multiple  
45 people have brought up the idea of allowing a small commercial/retail space. She added that during Jeff's  
46 presentation to the City Council, he discussed the possibility of decreasing traffic by allowing commercial space in  
47 the Life Cycle zone. It was discussed that it is a fine line and where does the Life cycle zone end and mixed use  
48 begin.

49 Mayor Drew discussed the possibility of percentages of non-residential use that if allowed could be much lower in  
50 a life cycle zone, than a mixed-use zone.

51 James Holloway stated what he felt the city is trying to do with this life cycle zone, which is a service oriented  
52 product availability and product convenience targeting the people that live in that community. Not drawing from  
53 or limiting the draw from outside the community.

54 Discussion ensued due to a question from R Holloway concerning populations. Does Providence have the resources  
55 for a large spike in population, as has happened before in Providence's history? It was discussed that Providence

1 does have the resources for a large spike in population, and they are always working to acquire more resources  
2 and better resources for the City and its residents.  
3 S Bankhead asked the Commission how they wanted to proceed. The overall opinion was to use the use chart and  
4 add a schematic of what to expect when building in the life cycle zone. B Fresz asked for more footnotes, or an  
5 appendix to explain the reasoning behind the whole lot regulation document.  
6 S Phippen stated that she would explain the reasoning behind the lot regulation code.  
7 The Commission agreed they are not ready for a public hearing yet, they need another meeting to review it with  
8 the changes made, the schematic added, the appendices and to review the use chart.  
9 R Holloway asked if S Phippen could make a side-by-side comparison of the mixed-use versus life cycle zone.

10  
11 **Item No.2. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss proposed amendments to  
12 Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations and Parking Requirements by adding  
13 Section 9 Design Standards for Residential Development.

14  
15 J Baldwin spoke to the Commission, he is concerned that they are going about writing this ordinance the hard way;  
16 he felt that it would be better to have in the ordinance what the City does not want, when it comes to design  
17 standards, instead of trying to list every good possible option. It will be easier for the City to control what they do  
18 not want to have in the community, opposed to trying to list all the good or better options. He recommended  
19 having illustrations or pictures of examples of what the City will not allow. He does not want to limit the ability to  
20 be creative, because the City did not think of that option earlier.

21 Multiple members of the Commission asked how to determine what looks good versus what does not, because  
22 everyone has different opinions.

23 J Baldwin felt that he could show the Commission pictures of townhomes or condominiums that everyone would  
24 agree do not look good; because they are not kept up, or because they are cookie cutter designs, that do not look  
25 good. Everyone has different taste, so as the City begins determining what looks good and what does not, they are  
26 tying the hands of the designers to come up with something that could look really good. He also thinks the City  
27 should not be able to deny someone to build because one person does not think it looks good, as long as it would  
28 fit into the community he feels that it should be allowed. He feels that it would be easier to exclude certain things  
29 instead of come up with an all-inclusive design standard.

30 R Holloway asked, since he has thought about this a lot, does he have a list of things he does not want to see in the  
31 City.

32 J Baldwin responded that he does not want to see 20'x60' boxes, or as he calls them "sweat boxes". He believes  
33 they do not have any architectural appeal. He felt like what he is really against, is not what the buildings are made  
34 out of, he is more opposed to the footprint of certain types of buildings.

35 B Fresz brought it back to the purpose of the design standards, the purpose of design standards it to "ensure that a  
36 single family attached and multi-family development is developed in a manner that provides attractively designed  
37 constructive and landscaped housing." B Fresz stated that he finds it hard to find any fault in that statement. The  
38 problem the Commission and the City is running into is how to go about fulfilling that statement.

39 J Baldwin discussed the possibility of sticking with a general statement of intent and to let the specific stuff go  
40 away.

41 S Bankhead discussed the problems with not having very specific design standards. She brought up a situation  
42 from last year with a property, where a developer wanted to build townhomes and a couple of small office spaces,  
43 a woman was very outspoken against the project because the City couldn't guarantee what the project would look  
44 like because of the lack of design standards. She asked J Baldwin, how to deal with that situation from a staff or  
45 City Council perspective.

46 Discussion ensued of how to go about dealing with that particular situation. It was pointed out that with every  
47 proposed development, many times neighbors are opposed. Many people opposed the Cobblestone [residential]  
48 development, but it has turned out to be a beautiful development that works really well.

49 J Baldwin felt that the proposed code is too specific. Up to this point, the design standards have been self-  
50 regulating with the purpose already behind the design standards. Is there different avenue the City could explore  
51 to gain the control it desires, if there is something the City really does not want in town? If there is not, then they  
52 can work around the design standard restriction by a general statement of intent that Providence is a town of  
53 diversity.

54 J Parker discussed how restrictive the current proposed code is, he felt that there needs to be a middle ground,  
55 where there are some standards, so that a developer doesn't come in and build something that will be falling apart

1 in 5 years, but also not have a code that is so restrictive that only certain colors are allowed. They discussed the  
2 possibility of having density standards to regulate the number of units per acre.  
3 S Bankhead discussed part of the code concerning building materials and colors; she felt that the code was not  
4 restrictive, but that it requires good quality materials that will not wear quickly.  
5 B Fesz felt that there are five philosophies when it comes to design standards:  
6 1. Design Standards via Park City, which is the book  
7 2. Standards with intent, not very enforceable, but give people an idea of what the city wants to see  
8 3. No standards and have an architectural committee  
9 4. No standards  
10 5. Every development has an HOA which would regulate itself  
11 J Baldwin liked B Fesz's second philosophy of having standards with intent.  
12 S Phippen believed that if there is no enforceability there is no purpose in having the code  
13 J Baldwin and B Fesz disagreed with S Phippen stating that having standards with intent is like having a guideline  
14 or philosophy of what the city would like to see.  
15 S Bankhead discussed the reasoning behind having design standards; it is to give the neighborhood protection. She  
16 also pointed out that if you do not spell out exactly what each neighborhood wants, you cannot give the  
17 neighborhood protection.  
18 Discussion ensued that the only way to make sure multi-family units look a certain way is to have an HOA that  
19 regulates itself.  
20 S Phippen added that these design standards would not affect Single Family Residential homes, the design  
21 standards are meant for multi-family units, the only time it would affect Single Family homes is when they are  
22 single-family homes within the Life Cycle Residential zone.  
23 J Baldwin replied that he liked the idea of having an HOA for the Life Cycle Zone. He felt that was the best way to  
24 have the protection that the city is concerned about for the surrounding neighborhoods.  
25 S Bankhead inquired about the practicality for all LCR properties to have an HOA. In some circumstances, such as  
26 building within an already developed area, is it practical to create an HOA for only a few homes or a four-plex?  
27 B Fesz recommended having HOA's be a part of the Life Cycle Residential zone.  
28  
29 **Item No. 3. General Plan:** The Providence Planning Commission will discuss a draft of the general plan, prepared  
30 by CRSA.  
31  
32 B Fesz provided his feedback on the document. He liked the statistics in the front. He likes the framework and the  
33 best practices. He liked the format of the document, that there are goals, objectives and strategies. He felt that it  
34 comes off as a philosophy and not a plan. He felt that there is one more level of detail is needed. As he looked at  
35 the strategies, he realized that there is a lot lacking. He wondered who is going to do what is all suggested to do.  
36 S Bankhead felt very similarly, that it is not so much a plan as it is many good ideas, but there is no plan of action.  
37 R Cecil felt the same way, this plan created a lot of work for someone to do.  
38 J Baldwin asked if they needed to have Tina come back because she had gone in the wrong direction.  
39 B Fesz felt that she had not gone in the wrong direction; she went into too much detail, she should have stopped  
40 at objectives and not gone into strategies.  
41 S Bankhead discussed a few of the strategies that were laid out in the plan, and pointed out that those strategies  
42 or objectives have already been completed and have been recorded somewhere else.  
43 J Parker felt that after the goals and the strategies there need to be action items, to determine how to accomplish  
44 the goals and strategies. It needs to be a living document that is always changing, once goals and strategies are  
45 accomplished.  
46 B Fesz pointed out a strategy that S Bankhead stated is already being done throughout the City; B Fesz asked  
47 where the strategy is written down.  
48 S Bankhead stated that it is part of the City Code and/or on the website.  
49 B Fesz felt that the strategies need to point to where the information is actually recorded. The general plan needs  
50 to reference the City Code and website.  
51 B Fesz felt what the General Plan is missing, is tying in the information the City already has to the General Plan.  
52 The strategies should help the City achieve the goals it has set, if the information is already there, they need to  
53 figure out how to reference that information without getting lost, but this general plan will also help the City  
54 identify things they don't have, and then can help them get them.

1 B Fresz felt that they need to make sure that the goals are truly in line with what the actual goals of the City are,  
2 and are the objectives going to help them achieve the goals they have set, and then examine the strategies and  
3 determine if they will help achieve the objectives.  
4 Discussion ensued concerning what is the next step for this general plan. They discussed the options of having  
5 workshops for each chapter, with the Planning Commission, City Council and City Staff. B Fresz also felt that CRSA  
6 should facilitate those workshops.  
7 S Bankhead stated that if the General Plan is going to be reevaluated every 5 years, the goals should be attainable  
8 within 5 years.  
9 B Fresz felt that the goals and objectives should be timeless; the strategies are what should be updated every 5  
10 years.  
11 Discussed ensued concerning whether they should take each chapter at a time and work on the goals, then the  
12 objectives and then the strategies; or should they decide on all of the goals and then objectives and then take each  
13 chapter at a time to work on strategies.  
14 R Holloway suggested starting on one chapter, which would help them get a better idea of what will and will not  
15 work, and then they can decide from there how to approach it.  
16 Multiple commissioners felt that it would be prudent to begin by determining the goals first for all chapters and  
17 then moving on to the objectives.  
18 S Bankhead also pointed out that it will be difficult to proceed one chapter at a time because they are all  
19 connected.  
20 Discussion ensued concerning the goals for the City. Each member was asked to bring ideas of how to change the  
21 goals for all five chapters.  
22 B Fresz asked S Bankhead if it is possible to have a workshop meeting with the City Council, Planning Commission  
23 and City Staff to determine the goals for the city.  
24 S Bankhead stated that she would talk to the Mayor and try to schedule that meeting for as soon as possible, but it  
25 may not be for 4 weeks.  
26

27 **Reports:**

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

30 S Bankhead:

- 31 -Developers of Providence Gateway Townhomes discussed the possibility of adding a secondary water system
  - 32 -Harassment and workplace violence training - Jan 18, 3-5pm
  - 33 -Training session on open meetings at City Council
  - 34 -Kristina Eck will be chairing a committee for Park & Recreation
- 35

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

38  
39 None

40  
41 **Motion to close meeting of January 10, 2018 made by R Cecil, seconded by J Parker.**

42  
43 **Vote**

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

45 **Nay:** None

46  
47 Prepared by K Soelberg.