

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**
2 **Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332**
3 **June 26, 2019 6:00 p.m.**
4

5 **Call to Order:** Bob Perry, Vice Chair

6 Excused: Gary Sonntag, Chair

7 Present: Laura Banda, Rowan Cecil, Joshua Paulsen, Robert Perry
8

9 **Approval of the Minutes:**

10 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for June 12, 2019.

11 **Motion to approve the minutes: — R Cecil, second — J Paulsen**

12 **Yea: L Banda, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry**

13 **Nay:**

14 **Excused:**

15 Corrections:
16

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

- 20 • No public comments
21

22 Note: The commission brought the following item forward because they needed to wait until 6:10 for
23 the public hearing.

24 **Item No. 2. Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval the final plat for
25 Vineyard Phase 1, a Life Cycle Residential subdivision containing 18 single-family detached homes, 20
26 townhomes, and 10 condominium units, located in the general area of 170 East Spring Creek Parkway.

- 27 • S Bankhead read from the staff report titled "Final Plat Phase 1 Analysis" included in the agenda
28 packet.
- 29 • S Bankhead noted that this particular development does not have apartments, even though it is
30 mentioned in the ordinance.
- 31 • S Bankhead said that the preliminary plat had the final drawings. We had seen the final plans
32 prior to the final plat.
- 33 • S Bankhead explained that the city may consider sharing the cost of water or sewer lines that
34 are larger than what is needed for the development.
- 35 • S Bankhead said that the emergency access for this phase is out of the phase boundaries.
36 However, it will provide the required access.
- 37 • S Bankhead explained that the developer will not be putting in sidewalk or park strip south of
38 the Spring Creek crossing, as that area is outside of the scope of their development. However,
39 they will provide a full width of asphalt, which is above and beyond what we normally require.
- 40 • S Bankhead said that the Development Agreement was approved by the City Council last night.
- 41 • S Bankhead reported that the developer has submitted quitclaim documentation as specified in
42 condition 2.
- 43 • S Bankhead said that the developer is working with John Hubbard on the easement
44 documentation as stated in condition 3.
- 45 • S Bankhead said that the feasibility study has been updated.
- 46 • S Bankhead said that the percentage requirements for the different housing types will be met
47 within the first two phases. It may not all be met within the first phase.
- 48 • S Bankhead explained the sidewalk deviation. We decided to incorporate the sidewalk with the
49 trail system and move it off of the road.

- 50 • J Paulsen asked about snow removal on the trail/sidewalk. Sometimes HOAs don't do snow
- 51 removal. There are people with mobility issues that need the snow removed.
- 52 • S Bankhead said that because it is a sidewalk, we can require the HOA to keep it clear. We do
- 53 contact HOAs to ask them to comply.
- 54 • S Bankhead said that there is an island in the middle of a public street that enters the
- 55 development. Although the road will be public, the island will be maintained by the HOA.
- 56 • J Paulsen asked if the sidewalk deviation is on city property.
- 57 • S Bankhead said that we have an easement for the sidewalk, but the land will not be dedicated
- 58 to the city.
- 59 • J Paulsen asked if it will be a public space with free speech rights, etc, as would be the case on a
- 60 standard city sidewalk. S Bankhead said she would have to look into that.
- 61 • S Bankhead said that the city is working on approving and signing the construction drawings as
- 62 stated in condition 5.
- 63 • B Perry asked about parcel 02-004-0003 that is 17 acres. This phase of the project will happen
- 64 on 7.44 acres [within that parcel]. S Bankhead said that this is correct.
- 65 • B Perry mentioned that there was a letter from Fish and Wildlife Services stating that there was
- 66 no danger to species and critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act.
- 67 • B Perry asked where FEMA comes in. Was there a holdup on the bridge?
- 68 • S Bankhead said that we are still working on the application to FEMA. Providence City has to sign
- 69 the application as the floodplain administrator.
- 70 • Dallas Nicoll of Visionary Homes said that he will submit the application as soon as the city signs
- 71 it.
- 72 • B Perry spoke about the 7.44 acres. S Bankhead said that it is part of the original [17 acre]
- 73 parcel, but it has been broken out as part of the subdivision process. The new townhome and
- 74 single family lots will have their own parcel numbers.
- 75 • D Nicoll said that the Hubbard and Bindrup deeds are all signed. He said that they will now be
- 76 improving the full road width along the project frontage [on Spring Creek Parkway].
- 77 • D Nicoll said that their intent is to have the HOA remove the snow from the trail.
- 78 • D Nicoll said that as far as the free speech zone, he is not sure. The easements are usually access
- 79 easements. The sidewalk won't happen until phase 3 and 4.
- 80 • D Nicoll spoke about the emergency access. 170 E is the road that will enter the development
- 81 and will be perpendicular to Spring Creek Parkway. They were planning on a temporary
- 82 turnaround, but there were too many units on that single access point. Now they will construct
- 83 a temporary fire access road to 300 East to the north of this phase.
- 84 • J Paulsen asked if the road will be on parcel 02-004-0003, or on one of the parcels to the north.
- 85 D Nicoll said that it will be on the parcels to the north.
- 86 • J Paulsen asked what zone those parcels are. S Bankhead said that she believes they are A10 in
- 87 the county. J Paulsen asked if county law allows them to build a temporary access road on A10
- 88 land. J Paulsen said that he had heard that it might not be allowed. D Nicoll and S Bankhead said
- 89 that they are not aware of anything that would prohibit it. S Bankhead said that she will look
- 90 into it. D Nicoll said that it will be a gated fire access road. (6:36).
- 91 • J Paulsen explained that he wants to be thorough about reviewing this subdivision because
- 92 citizens have been concerned about this property. He also would like to limit the city's potential
- 93 long-term liability. J Paulsen asked if this project requires a conditional use because of the high
- 94 water table.
- 95 • S Bankhead explained that as part of the process of approving the subdivision, the planning
- 96 commission is granting a conditional use.
- 97 • J Paulsen asked if the conditional use applies to each individual lot within the subdivision as far
- 98 as the requirement that no more than 40% of the surface of each lot will be a covered surface.

- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- 109
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114
- 115
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- 122
- 123
- 124
- 125
- 126
- 127
- 128
- 129
- 130
- 131
- 132
- 133
- 134
- 135
- 136
- 137
- 138
- 139
- 140
- 141
- 142
- 143
- 144
- 145
- 146
- S Bankhead said that she believes that is how that 40% calculation was made by the developer.
 - D Nicoll said that they considered all anticipated impervious areas. He said that because his company is the builder and the developer, they took into account each individual lot including building footprints, driveways, etc. However, a homeowner could make changes after the lots are sold that could violate the 40% rule.
 - J Paulsen said that such changes should require a permit from the city.
 - S Bankhead said that we could include a condition that all lots are required to seek a conditional use for any changes that are not shown on the plat. J Paulsen and B Perry said that they would like to add it as a condition.
 - J Paulsen asked about page 5 on the geotech report where it says “It is apparent that there is a lot going on at the site.” He said that this language is vague. It also says that a more detailed evaluation of the groundwater is beyond the scope of this investigation. J Paulsen said that he understands that the developer is only guaranteeing the soil conditions where the bore holes are, and asked if they will be making modifications as they progress.
 - D Nicoll said that they will. He said that there is a difference between a geotech report and a full ground water study. As they start building, they will make modifications as necessary.
 - J Paulsen asked if Visionary Homes will be abiding by the conditions and recommendations of this geotech report. D Nicoll said that they will.
 - S Bankhead said that the building inspector will also check that where they are putting foundations, etc., is adequate for building.
 - J Paulsen asked if the developer is putting in drainage systems. D Nicoll said that they will be.
 - J Paulsen asked about basements. D Nicoll said that the single family homes will have basements. J Paulsen said that the previous report recommended not having basements. D Nicoll said that the current report says that basements are not recommended without a drainage system. The drainage system will be installed with this phase. The geotech engineer is comfortable that the drain will be sufficient.
 - J Paulsen asked if homeowners will be notified about water table issues. D Nicoll said that this is standard practice, and they will be notified.
 - J Paulsen asked about the codes identifying the bore holes that are shown on the map.
 - D Nicoll said that “B” means it is a bore hole. A “TP” is a test pit where they opened up the site with a backhoe. “CPT” is a cone penetrometer test. “DCPT” is a dynamic cone penetrometer test. Those last two tests measure soil properties in situ.
 - J Paulsen asked about the measurements that are missing on page 4, section 3.7 Groundwater. B5, B10, and B12 are missing. D Nicoll didn’t know why they are missing. He guessed that perhaps the hole was disturbed.
 - J Paulsen asked what the nearest bore hole to the proposed detention basin is. J Paulsen said that the intent of LCR is to have integrated green space. He is concerned about green space that could be flooded with water and become unusable. High density housing needs usable green space, and if our code is allowing green space that is unusable, we should change the LCR code. He would like the development to have a usable soccer field, unlike the one near his home that floods frequently.
 - J Paulsen asked how the depth of the detention pond is determined. D Nicoll said that it is determined by the volume. This pond will be about 4 ft deep on average. Also, the land drain will decrease the water level.
 - L Banda asked about notifying buyers about the water table. Will it be a written disclosure upon sale? D Nicoll said that he is not sure how it happens because he is not involved in sales. S Bankhead said that we could put a note on the plat. D Nicoll said that he is comfortable putting a note on the plat that there is a potential for groundwater.

- 147
- 148
- 149
- 150
- 151
- 152
- 153
- 154
- 155
- 156
- 157
- 158
- 159
- 160
- 161
- 162
- 163
- 164
- 165
- 166
- 167
- 168
- 169
- 170
- 171
- 172
- B Perry asked if there was anything found in regards to the Fish and Wildlife letter. D Nicoll said that nothing was found.
 - Brenda Poulsen of Providence asked how the developer can guarantee that the homes won't flood. The homes to the north in Saddle Rock had drainage systems and yet most of them flooded during the first year. D Nicoll said that nobody can guarantee anything. However, he does not know what drainage system Saddle Rock used.
 - B Poulsen asked if the things that the developer has said that they will do in future phases can be changed. D Nicoll said that the preliminary plat looked at the whole parcel, including amenities, configuration, and road layouts. At the final plat stage, they plat phases one by one.
 - S Bankhead explained that if they want to amend their preliminary plat, the LCR zone requires that they go before the planning commission and the city council. With regular subdivisions, they would only have to go before the planning commission.
 - S Bankhead said that the preliminary plat locked in the entire 17 acres. For each phase, we make sure that the final plat matches the preliminary plat.
 - F Montoya asked if they are held to completing all parts of the project.
 - S Bankhead said that if they come to a stop, and they want to reevaluate, then they have to come back through the process.
 - J Paulsen said that the city approved the preliminary plat on the basis that there were no basements. Are we amending the preliminary plat by including basements?
 - S Bankhead said that she will look into that. She needs to see what the wording on the preliminary plat approval said.
 - J Paulsen also would like to make sure that M Pierce has a chance to review the plat.
 - D Nicoll asked if we could make this items conditions on the approval. J Paulsen thought that this would have to go through the Planning Commission and the City Council again because it is an amendment to the preliminary plat.

173 **Motion to continue the item to the next planning commission meeting: — J Paulsen, second — R Cecil**

174 **Vote:**

175 **Yea: L Banda, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry**

176 **Nay:**

177 **Abstained**

178 **Excused:**

179 Discussion prior to vote:

- 180
- 181
- 182
- 183
- 184
- 185
- 186
- 187
- 188
- 189
- 190
- 191
- 192
- 193
- B Perry asked if this motion is reasonable. S Bankhead said that it is reasonable to postpone the approval so that we can make sure we are doing the process correctly.
 - B Perry asked if J Paulsen's motion to continue the item would give more time for the FEMA approval. S Bankhead explained that within 30 days of the FEMA approval, the developer must begin construction of the bridge. The FEMA approval may be months away.
 - Natalie Pace of River Heights asked who will cover the liability if basements flood.
 - J Paulsen wasn't sure, but he said that if we have disclosed everything to the home owner, he is comfortable with the situation as a representative of the city.
 - Emily Merkly of Providence lives on 300 East. She said that she works in real estate. Flooding risk is up to the homeowner. However, flood insurance is expensive.
 - E Merkley asked if we track violation of sensitive areas, such as building RV pads [that exceed the 40% impervious area limitation].
 - S Bankhead said that this LCR zone is a new type of development for us. However, we do track people who violate sensitive areas. We can't guarantee that we catch everyone.

- 194
- 195
- 196
- 197
- 198
- 199
- 200
- 201
- 202
- 203
- 204
- 205
- 206
- 207
- 208
- 209
- 210
- 211
- 212
- 213
- 214
- 215
- 216
- 217
- 218
- 219
- 220
- 221
- 222
- 223
- 224
- 225
- 226
- E Merkly said that she has lived on 300 East for 9 years. The Chugg property will be an issue every year. They turn three crops a year without irrigation. That shows that there is a potential for water issues. She said that she has standing water in her property every year.
 - E Merkly is also concerned about what the plan is for 300 East. It will get more traffic because of the development. Will there be acquisition of property such as has been proposed on 100 South? She is concerned that the city will come in and expand the road. She said that there are traffic issues already on that road. There are also no sidewalks on her side of the road. This could mean that the city will want to expand the right of way to put in sidewalks. She felt that approving this development is premature if we do not have information on how the traffic will be affected.
 - S Bankhead said that in some areas, the road may already exceed our standards. She would have to look at the asphalt width or the right of way width to be sure. She said that she can't guarantee what a future council will do or not do. Currently, the street is handling the traffic appropriately.
 - E Merkley said that there is not room for visitors to her home to park on 300 East. Also, cars on that road pass other cars by going into oncoming traffic lanes. She is concerned that the issue of traffic on 300 East has not been discussed in conjunction with this development.
 - D Nicoll said that they have not performed a traffic study. Every development does not warrant a traffic study. The city engineer decides when that is appropriate. M Pierce has not asked for one.
 - E Merkley was concerned about how this development will affect her property value. She also is concerned about city standards that allow sidewalks without curb and gutter and a lack of safe streetside parking spaces.
 - S Bankhead said that all we can do [at the Planning Commission] is look at the existing standards. Those standards have changed dramatically in the past few years. Asphalt width as well as requirements for curb and gutter have been reduced.
 - E Merkley said that it is premature to approve the development without considering the things she has brought up. Does the commission want to set the standard on the first LCR development that we will not have traffic studies or consider the impact to the surrounding area?
 - J Paulsen said that he understands how E Merkley feels. All we can do is enforce the law that we have. We will try to be as thorough as we can.

227 **Public Hearing(s) Proposed zone assignment:** In preparation of a zone assignment associated with a
228 proposed annexation for Parcel No. 02-096-0058, generally located in the area of 505 West 500 South,
229 the Planning Commission is holding a public hearing to consider recommending a single-family high
230 zone. The purpose of the public hearing is to provide an opportunity for anyone interested to comment
231 on the proposal before action is taken. The Planning Commission invites you to attend the hearing in
232 order to offer your comments. You may also email comments to the City Recorder,
233 sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the day of the meeting. By law, email comments are
234 considered public record and will be shared with all parties involved, including the Planning Commission
235 and the applicant.

- 236
- No public comment
- 237

238 **Action Item(s):**

239 Action Item Note: Should the Planning Commission not be able to make a decision or take exception to
240 an Action Item(s), then that item will be tabled and revert back to a study category.

241 **Item No. 1. Proposed Zone Assignment:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for
242 recommendation to the City Council a Single-Family High (SFH) zone assignment associated with a

243 proposed annexation for Parcel No. 02-096-0058, generally located in the area of 505 West 500 South,
244 Providence.

- 245
- 246 • B Perry noted that on the transportation plan, there will be an extension to 500 south. The
247 proposed development borders single family residential areas on a few sides.
 - 248 • Craig Champlain, the owner of the property and the future developer, explained that he would
249 like to build a 55 and older development. They would like to build 5.5 lots per acre. He said that
250 this will be the 13th 55 and older project that he has done in Cache Valley. They have been well-
251 received, and they add to the neighborhood. They are well maintained.
 - 252 • R Cecil asked if they build single story homes.
 - 253 • C Champlain said that they build single story homes for the most part. Sometimes they build 1.5
254 stories. They try to avoid steps. Everything someone needs is on the main floor.
 - 255 • J Paulsen asked how long C Champlain has owned the property. C Champlain said it has been 1.5
256 months. The property owner wouldn't wait [for the annexation and zoning approval] to sell.
 - 257 • R Cecil asked why they are asking for single family high.
 - 258 • C Champlain said that they want the lots to be small. They are trying to develop small lots for
259 seniors.
 - 260 • S Bankhead clarified that this zone assignment recommendation is in preparation for an
261 annexation. Annexation zoning doesn't usually come to the planning commission because the
262 City Council will use the proposed annexation map. However, the future annexation map shows
263 this property as CHD. It is currently zoned A10 in the county. The council was willing to look at it
264 for future consideration for annexation. Because the zone is so different from what is on the
265 future annexation map, the council is sending it to the planning commission for review. This is
266 also the time for the staff to do their homework, and for the protest period to go through. If no
267 protests occur, the council could hold a public hearing on July 9 to consider the annexation and
268 zone assignment.
 - 269 • J Paulsen asked why Single Family High will be better for the city than Commercial Highway
270 District for this parcel.
 - 271 • C Champlain said that the distance it is off the highway is more suited to residential than
272 commercial. Commercial is dying because of online retail. Big box stores are dying. There is also
273 still a lot of commercial property in that area that the city can use for commercial. This property
274 is connected to the residential area. He said that the property is close to Maceys and shopping
275 which is convenient for the residents.
 - 276 • S Bankhead said that Brookside is zoned Single Family High. This is the type of zoning that C
277 Champlain is asking for.

278 **Motion to recommend a zone of Single Family High: — R Cecil**

279 Died for lack of a second.

- 280 • L Banda said that she is uncomfortable because once the zone is changed, other types of
281 developments could be done on the parcel. There is nothing to guarantee that the parcel will be
282 used for the development that C Champlain described.
- 283 • J Paulsen said that he is hesitant to give up tax base for the city. Residential development does
284 not add to the city's tax income.
- 285 • J Paulsen asked if this housing type is needed. He also doesn't think it is too far fetched to see
286 commercial development there. He would like the city council to consider these issues when
287 they deliberate on this annexation.
- 288 • R Cecil felt that it is far enough from the highway that it would not work as commercial.
- 289 • J Paulsen asked the developer what the size of his other developments have been. C Champlain
290 said that this is the largest he has done. It is about 45 lots. He has one in Logan is almost the
291 same size at 38 lots. He said that right now, they are selling fast. He feels that the demand will
292 go up further. He feels that the distance from the road is ideal. He said that if the property is
293 kept commercial, he will end up sitting on it for many years. He has a property in Logan that is

294 17 acres of prime commercial land between Jack’s Tire and Oil and the Hampton Inn. In 11
295 years, no one has expressed interest in using more than the front of the property. If we wait for
296 commercial, we will wait a very long time. There is also still plenty of commercial ground in the
297 area in question. He also said that the agent for the owner was trying to sell the parcel in
298 question for the residential market.

- 299 • C Champlain also said that this development will act as a buffer between the residential and the
300 commercial.
- 301 • R Cecil said that the property C Champlain developed in Logan is a prime facility. This
302 development would enhance Providence. There are many seniors who would want to live there.
303

304 **Item No. 3. Providence Planning Commission Bylaws:** The Commission will consider for

305 recommendation to the City Council amendments to the Providence Planning Commission Bylaws.

- 306 • J Paulsen said that he likes public comments, but he would like there to be a time limit. The city
307 council meeting last night went long. He feels that the time limit of three minutes per person is
308 appropriate. Also, if a public comment period is providing valuable input, the commission could
309 always vote to extend the time. He also said that having questions submitted by the public in
310 advance would make a better dialogue. We could address them preemptively.
- 311 • L Banda agreed. She said that public comment time should not be arbitrarily lessened, but it
312 could be extended as needed.
- 313 • L Banda said that it would be convenient for Planning Commission and City Council rules to be
314 the same. She also said that she hesitates to prohibit signs because of freedom of speech.
- 315 • B Perry said that if we allow signs, we will have to spend more time trying to control the
316 meeting.
- 317 • L Banda said that she just wants to make sure that we are not infringing on anyone’s right.
318 Restricting clapping may also be a problem.
- 319 • B Perry said that in his experience, the meetings that allowed signs were noisy, loud meetings.
320 He said that there is a place for signs, but he doesn’t feel like Planning Commission is the place.
- 321 • J Paulsen would like the attorney to weigh in on it. If it turns out to be legal, we could have a
322 stipulation such as keeping them to the back of the room. S Bankhead will check with the city
323 attorney.
- 324 • S Bankhead said that no changes were made to the bylaws at the staff level. B Perry asked if the
325 attorney has looked at the bylaws. S Bankhead said that he has.

326 **Motion to send the latest draft of the planning commission bylaws to city council to consider for**

327 **adoption:** — R Cecil, second — J Paulsen

328 **Yea:** Banda, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry

329 **Nay:**

330 **Abstained:**

331 **Excused:**

332 

333 **Study Items(s):**

334 **Item No. 1. General Plan revision review:** The Commission will review and discuss the draft chapters for
335 the general plan revision.

- 336 • J Paulsen asked that we put a citation on the statistics that we used.
- 337 • S Bankhead said that she thinks that the consultants left out chapter 4: “Land Use,
338 Neighborhoods, and Design.” The commission would have read that chapter on an earlier draft a
339 while ago. S Bankhead will get an updated version to the commission.
- 340 • Don Calderwood, former mayor of Providence, asked the commission to look very carefully at
341 the Life Cycle Zone in the General Plan. He also said that the terms for moderate income
342 housing and affordable housing are used as if they are the same thing throughout the draft. He

- 343 believes that there is a considerable difference between the terms. D Calderwood said that the
344 new council will probably reevaluate the life cycle zone. He may be one of those on the council
345 who will reevaluate it. D Calderwood felt that if the lots in LCR zones are small and there is no
346 basement, they will not sell well.
- 347 • D Calderwood felt that in order to achieve the goals set forth in the environmental stewardship
348 section, there would need to be a full time employee monitoring those aspects of the city.
 - 349 • D Calderwood said that the Life Cycle Zone concept isn't the problem. Rather, the problem is
350 where it is located and how it affects surrounding areas.
 - 351 • D Calderwood said that affordable housing would look more like a mobile home lot. He asked if
352 manufactured homes are allowed in the city. S Bankhead said that they are. She also said that
353 we have a mobile home zone in our zoning code, but we don't have any area designated in the
354 future zoning map for a mobile home park.
 - 355 • D Calderwood said that mobile home lots are required to be 6,000 square feet per lot, and yet
356 Life Cycle lots are allowed to be smaller than that.
 - 357 • J Paulsen said that he is uncomfortable with many aspects of the general plan, but hasn't
358 wanted to bring them all up because his colleagues have worked on the plan before he was
359 appointed to the commission.
 - 360 • J Paulsen said that the vision statement for the plan is conflicted. The vision statement says that
361 we are trying to preserve the agrarian essence of the city, while at the same time provide more
362 options to live, work and recreate in Providence. This is contradictory. The general plan also
363 talks a lot about moderate income housing, which could also contradict parts of the vision. J
364 Paulsen said that although he would not support the plan as it is now, he would like to see it
365 move forward to a public hearing. He would like to hear what the citizens of Providence have to
366 say.
 - 367 • S Bankhead said that there does need to be another public hearing on this. If she notices it
368 tomorrow, we should be able to do it on July 10th. She also said that sometimes public hearings
369 are difficult, because the public asks for things that we can't legally give them. However, if the
370 commission feels that the plan has strayed from what the general public wants, we could
371 benefit from more public hearings.
 - 372 • D Calderwood explained that the City Council cannot dictate to the Planning Commission. The
373 council can remove planning commission members, but he thinks that this is unlikely to happen.
 - 374 • D Calderwood felt that the commission should anticipate that the new council will make some
375 changes.
 - 376 • S Bankhead clarified a discussion from earlier about mobile home lots. Our city code requires
377 them to be at least 5,000 sq ft, not 6,000 sq ft.
 - 378 • S Bankhead said that the commission could schedule a second meeting in July. Traditionally,
379 they have only had one meeting in July. B Perry said that he will contact G Sonntag about having
380 a public hearing on July 10th.
 - 381 • R Cecil said that G Sonntag will no longer be the chair in July. He cannot succeed himself as per
382 the bylaws.
 - 383 • S Bankhead said that there has to be a public hearing before this plan can go to the city council.
 - 384 • J Paulsen asked B Perry what his thoughts are about the timing of approving this general plan in
385 light of the change that will come on the city council. Almost all of the council members will be
386 new.
 - 387 • B Perry felt that there was no problem with getting the public's opinion.
 - 388 • L Banda felt that it might be counterproductive to bring this plan forward before the elections.
 - 389 • R Cecil said that we have been doing this for three years. It has been written and re-written.
 - 390 • B Perry asked if there was a date that this plan was supposed to be finished. S Bankhead said
391 that there is not a specific requirement, but that it probably should have been done two years

392 ago. We have spent a long time working on the general plan. S Bankhead said that the Life Cycle
393 Zone derailed the general plan process a bit. The plan is about more than that zone. S Bankhead
394 agreed with J Paulsen that some of the statements in the general plan are contradictory.
395 However, there are some things that have good merit, and that will apply to any zone. She
396 wouldn't suggest throwing out the whole plan. It probably would have been good to have done
397 some more public hearings about the plan, but the commission and the staff did the best that
398 they could at the time. The commission and the staff also did the best they could to use the
399 comments from the initial steering committees and open house/workshop. We got feedback at
400 the time in favor of integrated communities and complete streets. We also used ideas about
401 traffic calming as a basis for making narrower streets. There is a trend right now to rethink
402 streets. The plan followed some of those principles.

- 403 • J Paulsen said that he feels that a public hearing would be beneficial. He would not vote for this
404 general plan until the new city council comes in. He would also like to postpone a decision on
405 the Life Cycle zone. He feels that the next council will get rid of the zone. At the public hearing,
406 he would like the public to know that the hearing does not mean that the plan is final.
- 407 • B Perry noted that the commission was tasked by the mayor to get the plan done in a timely
408 manner.
- 409 • J Paulsen said that he believes that it is morally wrong to make decisions that are against public
410 opinion, and try to do them quickly because it is the only time to get them done. He feels that
411 the mayor is trying to rush a lot of controversial issues through before the election.
- 412 • B Perry said that we will plan for a public hearing.
- 413 • S Bankhead said that in the public hearing notice, she can state that the commission is seeking
414 public input. We don't even have to put the plan as an action item on the agenda. It can be for
415 discussion or public input only.
- 416 • J Paulsen asked if we could have a larger venue for the public hearing. S Bankhead can check
417 with the schools about using their space.
- 418 • J Paulsen felt that July would be too soon. He would like more time to invite people. L Banda
419 agreed. Many people are also out of town at that time. J Paulsen would also like people to have
420 time to write comments in advance.

421 **Motion to have a public hearing for the general plan in the first half of August at another venue**
422 **that can accommodate 300-400 citizens: — J Paulsen, second — L Banda.**

423 **Vote:**

424 **Yea: B Perry, L Banda, J Paulsen**

425 **Nay: R Cecil**

426 **Abstained:**

427 **Excused:**

428 **Discussion:**

- 429 • L Banda suggested using the Providence Pipeline and other notification methods to spread
430 the word about the hearing. S Bankhead said that we can use the Pipeline.
- 431 • R Cecil said that he feels like we are just pushing things back. We do need a public hearing,
432 but we don't need 300 people.

433
434 **Item No. 2. Ordinance and Design Standards for Life Cycle Residential Zone, LCR:** The Commission will
435 review and discuss the proposed changes for Title 10 Chapter 4, LCR Zone.

436 **Motion to table the LCR amendments: — J Paulsen, second — L Banda**

437 **Vote:**

438 **Yea: Banda, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry**

439 **Nay:**

440 **Abstained**

441 **Excused:**

442

443 **Reports:**

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

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

- 447
- 448 • L Banda asked if the bylaw that says that the chair cannot succeed himself has always been
449 implemented. Was Robert James chair two times in a row? S Bankhead thought that he
450 was.
 - 451 • R Cecil felt that maybe we just didn't know about the bylaws in the past.
 - 452 • L Banda said that G Sonntag stepped in when R James left. He has not served a full term as a
453 chair. Maybe he can succeed himself in that case.
 - 454 • R Cecil said that when he was first on the commission, the person who had been on the
455 commission the longest became chair. R Cecil became chair through this process. When his
456 term ended, however, he selected who he wanted the new chairman to be and made a
457 motion to accept them as chair.
 - 458 • L Banda and B Perry asked S Bankhead to find out if G Sonntag can succeed himself as chair.
459 L Banda would like G Sonntag to have the opportunity to continue to be the chair if he
460 would like to.
 - 461 • S Bankhead said that she will find out. The bylaws may allow the commission to override
462 the bylaws. If they don't allow that, then we will have to follow them.

463 **Motion to close the meeting: — R Cecil, second — L Banda**

464 **Vote:**

465 **Yea: Banda, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry**

466 **Nay:**

467 **Excused:**

468 **Abstained:**

469

470 Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:35 PM

471 Minutes prepared by Jesse Bardsley

472

473

474

475

476 _____
Gary Sonntag, Chair

477

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder