

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**
2 **Providence City Office Building,**
3 **164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332**
4 **August 28, 2019 6:00 p.m.**

5
6 Call to Order: Gary Sonntag, Chair
7 Roll Call of Commission Members: Laura Banda, Bob Perry, Gary Sonntag, Rowan Cecil, Josh Paulsen
8 Excused: Ruth Ann Holloway
9 Pledge of Allegiance: Gary Sonntag

10
11 **Oath of Office:** Planning Commission Alternate — Kathleen Alder

- 12
- 13 • Kathleen Alder was sworn in as a Planning Commission Alternate.
 - 14 • G Sonntag said that as an alternate, K Alder can participate in the discussion, but tonight she will not vote
15 because she is the second alternate and there are four regular members present [and J Paulsen is acting
16 as the fifth].

17 **Approval of the Minutes:**

18 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for August 14, 2019.

19 **Motion to approve the minutes with the addition of the clarification proposed by Gary Sonntag: — R Cecil,**
20 **second — B Perry**

21 **Vote:**

22 **Yea: L Banda, R Cecil, B Perry, G Sonntag**

23 **Nay:**

24 **Abstained: J Paulsen**

25 **Excused:**

26 **Discussion:**

- 27
- 28 • G Sonntag spoke about his comments on line 108. He said that he was responding to Sharell Eames’
29 question about LCR zoning on the Chugg property, and he thought that she was referring to the north
30 parcel rather than the southern parcel that has already been approved. He felt that the minutes did not
31 reflect his intention, because it made it sound like he was talking about the [southern] parcel.
 - 32 • G Sonntag read a proposed revised version of his comment: “G Sonntag said that it is. [The northern
33 parcel] was in the annexation policy plan. The city council then received an application and approved the
34 annexation and assigned an LCR zone. The annexation and zone assignment is subject to a referendum.
35 However, the Planning Commission felt that they had no choice but to show it on the future rezone map
36 as LCR because of the city council's approval.”
 - 37 • R Cecil agreed with the revision.
 - 38 • K Alder felt that the minutes are reflective of what was said. We could put a note about what was meant,
39 but we shouldn’t change what was said.
 - 40 • G Sonntag said that the minutes are a paraphrase, and not an exact quote.
 - 41 • R Cecil said that we should leave the minutes the way they are, but have the revised comment included in
42 today’s minutes as a clarification.
 - 43 • J Bardsley said that when he makes the minutes, he paraphrases what was said. He is comfortable with
44 either the revised comment or the original comment as summaries of what was meant.

45 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the Planning Commission to express their views on issues within
46 the City’s jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Commission. Remarks are limited to 3 minutes per
47 person. The total time allotted to public comment is 21 minutes. Persons wishing to address the Commission
48 during Public Comments should sign on the public comment sign-in sheet located at the entry to the meeting
49 room.

- 50
- 51 • Gary Sonntag read from the new Planning Commission bylaws about order and decorum in the meeting
52 [this comment occurred prior to the Oath of Office].
 - 53 • No public comments.

54 **Study Items:**

55 **Item No. 2. Proposed Rezone:** Pioneer Builders Company Inc. is requesting a rezone for the north portion
56 (approximately 18,000 sq. ft.) of Parcel 02-098-0010, located at 52 E Center, Providence UT. The property is
57 currently zoned Commercial General District (CGD); applicant is requesting Multi-Family Residential (MFR).

- 58 • S Bankhead explained that this is the small bungalow building that is north of the Old Rock Church
59 building. It is on the east side of the east parking lot.
- 60 • B Perry noted that on the paperwork, it says Multi Family Medium instead of Multi Family Residential. S
61 Bankhead said we should go with what is in writing, even though they told her Multi Family Residential
62 was what they were requesting.
- 63 • S Bankhead said that because it is currently in the Commercial General District, bed and breakfasts are
64 allowed, but a residential living unit is not. The reason that we do not want residential units allowed in the
65 Commercial General District is that we would then have to allow residential treatment centers in the
66 district. We would like to save our limited commercial space for other uses.
- 67 • S Bankhead said that the applicants would like their manager to live on site. This is not possible with the
68 current zoning. S Bankhead explained that they are requesting multi family instead of single family in case
69 that they want to do something different in the future, such as renting the bed and breakfast units as
70 apartments.
- 71 • S Bankhead said that the applicant didn't want to rezone the entire parcel, but they need to rezone
72 enough area so that they meet the minimum qualifications. In an MFR zone, they can have 7.25 units per
73 acre. They would need 6,000 square feet of space per unit. If it was Multi-Family Medium (MFM), they
74 wouldn't have to rezone as large of an area of the lot. However, they might be able to tear that building
75 down and build a building with more than three units if it is MFM.
- 76 • R Cecil noted an error in the agenda. The parcel number doesn't match what is on the parcel viewer map.
- 77 • J Paulsen asked if the applicants will need to subdivide their parcel in order to zone part of it differently
78 from the other part. S Bankhead said that in the past, we haven't made applicants subdivide properties in
79 order to rezone a portion of the parcel.
- 80 • J Paulsen asked if there is any way to combine conditional uses and Multi Family Medium zoning so as to
81 prevent them from doing a tear-down and rebuild.
- 82 • S Bankhead said that there is not really a way to do that. Once it is rezoned, we have to allow whatever
83 building that zone allows. We are not allowed to do zoning by condition. With large developments, we
84 can enter into development agreements that give us a little bit more confidence about what we will get.
85 With this one, it would be difficult.
- 86 • R Cecil asked about parking. S Bankhead said that they can share the parking with the Old Rock Church.
- 87 • G Sonntag asked what the city's vision for the downtown area of Providence is. S Bankhead said that
88 according to the General Plan, it is to keep that area of commercial downtown and have the area around
89 it be single family residential.
- 90 • J Paulsen asked if the buildings are subject to historic preservation restrictions. S Bankhead said that the
91 Old Rock Church is, but not the adjacent building that we are discussing.
- 92 • G Sonntag asked if they do bed and breakfast inside the Old Rock Church. S Bankhead said that they do.
- 93 • G Sonntag asked if there has been a plan to enhance the downtown area of Providence, such as changing
94 the streetscapes, etc.
- 95 • S Bankhead said that many people like the streets and the trees the way they currently are in the
96 downtown. Several years ago, we worked with the Historic Preservation Commission to talk about
97 ordinances to preserve the historic area of Providence. It didn't go anywhere because of concerns about
98 the restrictions it would place on property owners. S Bankhead said that state code does allow you to put
99 some ordinances in place to preserve historic areas. It limits what you can do, however.
- 100 • G Sonntag said that he is not necessarily in favor of pursuing a historic area at this time. However, this
101 proposal should make us think about what we want in that area. He said that there are two separate
102 questions about this lot: whether we want multi family zoning at all, and then if we do, what density of
103 multi family zoning we want.
- 104 • J Paulsen asked if the property owner is prohibited from having a tenant in that building as a caretaker
105 [under current zoning].
- 106 • S Bankhead said that our code prohibits it. If someone had been using it as a residential use before it was
107 zoned commercial, and they had continued to use it, then it could be a legal non-conforming use. But we

- 108 can't change the use back to a non-conforming use once the non-conforming use has not been used for a
109 year or more.
- 110 • B Perry asked if this will impact the placement of the historic post office that the Historic Preservation
111 Commission is trying to place within that area. S Bankhead said that the owner of the post office is
112 currently considering a different location.
 - 113 • J Paulsen said that he appreciates the idea of a historic preservation district. He felt that the spirit of the
114 property owner's request is reasonable. However, he is uncomfortable changing the zone when we can't
115 control what it ultimately becomes. He asked if this is the only option we have in order to meet the
116 property owner's request.
 - 117 • S Bankhead said that we have explored several options and have encountered stumbling blocks. Even the
118 multi family zoning option has a stumbling block, because currently bed and breakfasts are not allowed in
119 multi family zones. However, we are in the process of considering changing that.
 - 120 • S Bankhead said that there are some things that we can do to preserve the aesthetics of the historic
121 district that the commission may want to consider. For example, we currently allow accessory dwelling
122 units in all residential districts, and may soon allow accessory apartments [which could change the
123 character of the area].
 - 124 • G Sonntag said that he would advise not changing the historic district until we have a desire to change its
125 use (such as to multi family), or until we have an idea to enhance its historic character, such as adding a
126 town square, etc.
 - 127 • R Cecil asked if we could get the Historic Preservation Commission's input.
 - 128 • K Alder asked if it would be possible to change the zone now, and then change it back if the owner sells
129 the property.
 - 130 • S Bankhead said that we would not be able to do that unless the owner requested a zone change. She said
131 that there is also nothing preventing the current owner from taking that house down and building
132 something else that qualifies for a commercial district. The commission may want to consider allowing
133 owners to repurpose buildings so that they do not tear down the historic homes to make way for
134 something more profitable.
 - 135 • J Paulsen asked if the Old Rock Church is under restrictions because of its historic designation.
 - 136 • S Bankhead said that it is on the register of historic places, but that is more of an honorary designation. If
137 they receive tax breaks, there is only a certain number of years that they are required to maintain the
138 historic character after receiving them.
 - 139 • S Bankhead said that several years ago, we worked with the Historic Preservation Commission to try to
140 preserve some old homes that were not on the register of historic places. However, it is a hard thing to do
141 because the limitations can create a hardship for property owners.
 - 142 • G Sonntag felt that a roundabout at Main and Center might help the area. He also felt that we should
143 consider incentives or other measures to preserve the Old Rock Church. There might also be things that
144 we could do to help hobby farmers in the historic area of the city.
 - 145 • S Bankhead said that hobby farmers are one of the reasons that our animal control laws are as loose as
146 they are. We don't require much space for animals. A previous council made those rules because they
147 wanted to preserve the animal-friendly nature of the downtown area.
 - 148 • G Sonntag asked the commission what their feeling is about the proposed multi-family zoning.
 - 149 • L Banda said that she would like some time to do further study on this item. She likes the idea of the
150 historical district.
 - 151 • G Sonntag said that the applicant could also ask for a rezone to Single Family Traditional. J Paulsen said
152 that if they did, they wouldn't be able to use the other units for bed and breakfast.
 - 153 • K Alder said that in order for the owner to run the Old Rock Church as a business and preserve the
154 building, he needs to have an onsite caretaker. This is something we should consider.
 - 155 • G Sonntag asked how the owner is doing things now.
 - 156 • R Cecil said that when he was part of a census crew in 2010, there were workers living in the building
157 [illegally].
 - 158 • K Alder said that in the hospitality business, on-site management is necessary.
 - 159 • G Sonntag asked about amending definitions for the Commercial Zone. S Bankhead said we could do that
160 if we were willing to open up commercial areas to more residential uses.
 - 161 • B Perry felt that the Historic Preservation Commission should look at this case.

162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216

Public Hearing(s): (6:30 PM) Prior to making a recommendation on the proposed General Plan Comprehensive Revision and the Future Zoning Map, Parks and Open Space Map, and Transportation Classification Map, the Planning Commission is holding a public hearing. The purpose of the public hearing is to provide an opportunity for anyone interested to comment on the proposal before action is taken. The Planning Commission invites you to attend the hearing in order to offer your comments. You may also email comments to the City Recorder, sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the day of the meeting. Email comments are public record and will be given to the Planning Commission and Applicant. Remarks during the hearing are limited to 5 minutes per person. The total time allotted to hearing comment is 50 minutes. Persons wishing to address the Commission during public hearing should sign on the sign-in sheet for the public hearing located at the entry to the meeting room.

- No public comments.

Action Item(s):

Action Item Note: Should the Planning Commission not be able to make a decision or take exception to an Action Item(s), then that item will be tabled and revert back to a study category. The applicant will have 15 minutes to introduce and make a brief presentation.

Item No. 1. Preliminary Plat Approval. The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval a preliminary plat for the Jensen Farm Subdivision, a 5-lot residential subdivision in a single-family traditional district, located in the general area of 196 W 100 N, Providence UT.

Motion to approve the preliminary plat for the Jensen Farm Subdivision: — R Cecil, second — L Banda

Vote:

Yea: L Banda, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag

Nay:

Abstained:

Excused:

- Jim Macfarlane, the applicant, and Michael Taylor, the project engineer, introduced themselves.
- M Taylor explained that this is the 2 acre piece that sits at the corner of 100 North and 200 West. There have been several proposals on this lot. This is a new proposal. It proposes leaving the original home on its own lot, and subdividing the remainder of the parcel into 4 additional lots. No roadway improvements will be required, because the project fronts two roads that are fully improved. Utility services will need to be cut in for the additional lots. Both of the roads along this project are county roads. They have prepared a traffic impact memo indicating that there would not be any adverse impact on the county's facilities or maintenance budgets.
- S Bankhead noted the deed restriction on lot 2 relative to the outbuildings. The buyer of lot 2 has 18 months to present a house plan and begin construction which incorporates the existing structures, or the structures must be demolished.
- G Sonntag asked what the reason for keeping those structures is. J Macfarlane said that the current property owner will keep the lots with the outbuilding for the time being.
- K Alder asked if there are any buyers for the lots. J Macfarlane said that there are not at this point.
- G Sonntag said that this proposal would generate a lot less traffic than the proposal that was presented for this property a few years ago. G Sonntag said that this intersection has been a focal point of traffic concerns. He asked if staff has considered a roundabout at the intersection of 200 W and 100 N.
- S Bankhead said that we have not considered a full traffic circle. If we did consider a traffic circle, it would probably be a modified version. G Sonntag said that we should look at whether a roundabout would impact lot #1.
- M Taylor explained that on the preliminary plat, they had proposed a detention basin. More recently, they have been proposing that each lot owner would retain their own storm water.
- J Macfarlane explained that there will be an easement on the properties for storm water.
- G Sonntag asked if the water and sewer is adequate [in the area to handle the new development].
- S Bankhead said that the applicant will be installing some new services. R Stapley, Public Works director, thought that it would be easier to have a cut in 200 West for sewer and another cut in 100 North rather than maintaining a sewer line on an easement through the lots, as was proposed originally.

- G Sonntag asked about street lighting. S Bankhead said that there is already street lighting in that area.

Study Items(s):

Item No 1. General Plan and Maps: The Planning Commission will discuss the proposed General Plan Comprehensive Revision and the Future Zoning Map, Parks and Open Space Map, and Transportation Classification Map.

- G Sonntag said that the general plan has been worked on for three years. It is as good as it is going to get. The next council can amend it, but they will need something to work from. He hopes that we can come to terms with it this meeting, and approve it at the next meeting.
- J Paulsen spoke about the proposed SFT zone in the highlands on the future rezone map. He would like to keep part of that area SFL around the areas that are currently zoned SFL. Some citizens have requested this and he feels that it is a reasonable compromise.
- G Sonntag said that we could draw a line extending from 1000 South one lot width past the current SFL zone, and then south along 800 E, to create a bubble of SFL around the lots that are currently zoned SFL.
- J Paulsen said that we could draw a line from 1000 South all the way to the east border of the property, and then continue south either to the south property line, or the south property line of the parcel to the south, and make that all SFL. He would like there to be a continuous chunk.
- G Sonntag said that we are trying to find a middle ground for this area, something that is flexible and compatible with what is already in the area. SFT is already up in that area. A developer can choose to build SFL-sized lots even in an SFT area.
- R Cecil agreed.
- J Paulsen said that it is currently zoned Single Family Large. To compromise, we should have some SFL and some SFT. The developer bought into an SFL zone, and so giving them some SFT, but not all, is a fair compromise.
- G Sonntag said that the commission members may not have been aware that there were SFL lots already developed in that area. The thought process was that since there are SFT lots nearby, people should be OK with SFT in that area.
- K Alder said that the concern of the citizen who commented last meeting was about preserving the distance between her home and the next home by keeping the lots large.
- G Sonntag said that perhaps we are overthinking this. Maybe we should just leave it as Single Family Large on the map. If a developer comes in and requests Single Family Traditional, however, people shouldn't have a problem with that.
- G Sonntag said that during the hearings for the LCR zone for the highlands, the people from the Single Family Traditional areas were concerned about LCR in that area. This is why the commission thought that Single Family Traditional would be good for those areas.
- J Paulsen said that the no matter what we put on the future rezone map, the developer can request whatever they want. Maybe we are over thinking.
- S Bankhead said that the Planning Commission is supposed to look to the future. If a developer comes in and asks where they could put a single family traditional development, city staff will look at the general plan. If the commission feels that the area should remain SFL, then they should keep it SFL. If they would entertain smaller lots, however, they should have some be SFT. Developers can still request something different, but city staff tries to live by the general plan and direct developers to those areas indicated by the plan.
- J Paulsen said that in that case, he would like to propose the SFL/SFT split that he brought up earlier. He feels that there are natural divisions in the land that would allow a seamless transition between the zones.
- The commission decided to make the area from 1000 south across to the east property line, thence south to the property line of that parcel, SFL on the future rezone map. To the north and the south of that area will be SFT on the future rezone map.
- J Paulsen suggested that once this map is approved, that we send a copy to the developer who has been trying to develop that area.
- J Paulsen brought up the area near Highway 165 that is shown as Commercial Highway District. There is a parcel that was recently zoned to Single Family High that is not shown on the map.
- J Paulsen asked if we are still planning on a traffic corridor [to the highway] in that area.

- 271
- 272
- 273
- 274
- 275
- 276
- 277
- 278
- 279
- 280
- 281
- 282
- 283
- 284
- 285
- 286
- 287
- 288
- 289
- 290
- 291
- 292
- 293
- 294
- 295
- 296
- 297
- 298
- 299
- 300
- 301
- 302
- 303
- 304
- 305
- 306
- 307
- 308
- 309
- 310
- 311
- 312
- 313
- 314
- 315
- 316
- 317
- 318
- 319
- 320
- 321
- 322
- 323
- S Bankhead said that we are. She said that another developer is interested in developing on the west side of the highway in that area. We would like to bring 500 South through to intersect with the highway just north of Ballard Springs. The developer on the east side of the highway shows 500 south coming through the development on his plans.
 - G Sonntag said that another option is that we could put a road through to the highway that would intersect with the current south ends of 480 W and Garden Drive.
 - J Paulsen brought up the triangular parcel south of the Chugg property that is shown as LCR on the map (parcel #02-004-0004). He doesn't recall discussing that as a commission. He feels that it is premature to put that parcel as LCR, due to the ongoing discussion about the zone.
 - S Bankhead said that the parcel was marked as LCR some time ago, before J Paulsen was a member of the commission.
 - R Cecil said that we should keep it as LCR since it is against the LCR that we already approved. L Banda said that there is also Single Family Traditional against that parcel. J Paulsen said that a road separates that parcel from the current LCR.
 - J Paulsen said that he doesn't think it should remain zoned as Agricultural. He would prefer SFT for that parcel, or SFH. He said that the parcel is separated from the parcel currently zoned LCR by Spring Creek Parkway, which we are planning as a major road. S Bankhead agreed that we are planning it is a major road. J Paulsen said that he can also see the argument that areas along major roads would work well for higher density because we don't want all the cars driving through neighborhoods.
 - G Sonntag asked the commission what they would like that parcel to be.
 - R Cecil would like it to remain LCR.
 - B Perry said that he would prefer SFT.
 - L Banda would prefer SFT.
 - K Alder felt that suggesting a higher density zone in that area is worth considering because it is on a collector road.
 - J Paulsen said that he could support Single Family High. It preserves the residential feel, works well next to the LCR, and would provide lower priced homes. He feels that the citizens would respect that choice.
 - G Sonntag said that he would go with Single Family High to break the tie of opinions.
 - Vickie Holmgren of Providence asked what Single Family High is. G Sonntag explained that it is a residential 6,000 sq ft lot.
 - L Banda said that she wanted Single Family Traditional to reduce the density and traffic in that area.
 - G Sonntag said that we will put [the triangular] parcel as Single Family High.
 - G Sonntag explained that the north parcel of the Chugg property is subject to a referendum.
 - S Bankhead explained that unless the council holds a special election, when a referendum petition is received after January 31st on an election year, state code specifies that the referendum will be on the ballot on the second municipal election. This means that it will be on the ballot in 2021.
 - K Alder asked about why the parcel was annexed as LCR. S Bankhead said that a previous planning commission was more pro-LCR. They held public hearings on the LCR zone, and didn't receive much negative feedback. The negative feedback came later, when parcels were actually suggested for the LCR zone.
 - G Sonntag asked what the commission should do with this parcel on the map while it waits for a referendum. J Paulsen felt that we should leave it the way it is until after the referendum.
 - S Bankhead said that there are a few little things in the LCR ordinance that need to be changed. Staff did start talking about those, but then the discussion expanded and got out of control. We still need to get back to that discussion. The commission will have a strong voice in what we come up with. If the voters vote in favor of the LCR zone on the referendum, then that parcel will go in as LCR as it is currently defined. However, if it is not approved, the commission could make a new version of the zone that the applicant could apply for, or they could suggest Single Family High, Single Family Residential, etc. With this map, the commission gets to decide what they would ideally like to see there.
 - Vickie Holmgren of Providence said that as she has talked to people, what they are really against is the LCR zone, not annexation of the property or single family homes. She felt that if that property is left as LCR, the annexation will never go through. If the city tries to slide it in with a zone that is similar to LCR, people will still be against it. The townhomes and multi-family dwellings are what people are against.

- 324 • G Sonntag said that nothing will be “slid in.” Anything that is modified will be brought to a public hearing
325 at the Planning Commission and City Council. What is currently shown on the map is there because that is
326 what the city council decided.
- 327 • J Paulsen said that we are in a holding pattern until 2021. He agrees with V Holmgren that people don’t
328 want LCR in that area. If the citizens reject LCR on that parcel, then that LCR will be taken off the map, and
329 the commission will have to decide what they want in that area.
- 330 • G Sonntag said that we will leave that parcel as LCR.

331 Transportation Map:

- 332 • L Banda brought up the proposed road on the east that connects to Canyon Road and follows the power
333 lines. She was concerned that this road is connected to Canyon Road, and yet not all of Canyon Road is
334 marked for upgrading its capacity. On the north end of the proposed road, it connects into what is
335 currently a cul-de-sac.
- 336 • J Paulsen asked where the idea for this road came from.
- 337 • S Bankhead explained that the idea for a north-south corridor came from the county. Aso, some residents
338 in the downtown wanted to keep the upper traffic on the bench. There needed to be a road to connect
339 the north bench and the south bench so that traffic doesn’t have to go through the downtown
340 neighborhoods to get from north to south on the bench. There is also a bike route there.
- 341 • K Alder asked if there are homes currently at the cul-de-sac where the road ends. G Sonntag said that
342 there are not currently. J Paulsen said that we should designate the current roads that the future road
343 connects to on the north as minor collectors. S Bankhead agreed.
- 344 • K Alder asked if the land is buildable on the east side of the proposed road. S Bankhead said that it is [at
345 least in part]. She said that there is a place where the road can be built, although it may not be exactly as
346 shown on the map.
- 347 • G Sonntag suggested putting language on the map that says that roads that do not currently exist are
348 subject to realignment.
- 349 • S Bankhead said that one reason that the road is placed there is because the power lines are there. Rocky
350 Mountain Power will not allow houses to be there, and therefore it makes sense to use the area for a
351 road.
- 352 • J Paulsen asked if our designations of minor collector, major collector, etc, affect the road width and
353 engineering, or if they are just projections of future traffic.
- 354 • S Bankhead said that it both affects the way the road is engineered, and serves as a projection of future
355 traffic.
- 356 • G Sonntag said that he picked the road designations based on what would be good for the city as far as
357 traffic flow, not based on current road widths.
- 358 • L Banda said that she sees the need for the road in that area, but she is concerned that Canyon Road will
359 be handling all of that traffic and is not designated for an upgrade across its entire length.
- 360 • G Sonntag said that if we can’t make this road make sense, we could remove it from the map.
- 361 • S Bankhead said that Canyon Road currently carries quite a bit of traffic.
- 362 • J Paulsen agreed with L Banda. He said there is a curve on Canyon Road that is dangerous to bicyclists and
363 pedestrians. Before we do anything with Canyon Road, we need to put sidewalks there, etc.
- 364 • The commission decided that the gold color showing that the existing road will be upgraded should
365 extend down Canyon Road to the intersection of 300 S and 100 East.
- 366 • K Alder said that if 300 South ever goes through from 100 East to 200 East, there will be a lot of traffic at
367 the intersection of 300 S and 100 East. S Bankhead said that the city owns right of way to make that road
368 go through. At some point, the city could design a safe road through there, despite the incline. However,
369 the 300 S 100 E intersection is a bigger challenge than the road itself.
- 370 • G Sonntag said that we should take away the bicycle route’s purple color on future Grandview Drive so
371 that it is clear that it is designated as a Future Traffic Corridor 66 FT.
- 372 • L Banda suggested that Future Grandview be designated as a minor collector, like the road that goes
373 through Little Baldy subdivision, instead of as a traffic corridor.
- 374 • K Alder said that we should have Future Grandview ending at Sherwood Drive.
- 375 • G Sonntag said that we should take the bicycle routes completely off of the transportation map. They are
376 already shown on the trails map.

- 377 • G Sonntag said that he would like to put a note on the map that all proposed roads are subject to further
378 evaluation and study.
379 • R Cecil brought up the future road that would connect 300 S and 100 South west of 485 West. He said
380 that the way it is currently drawn on the map would run into buildings. He suggested moving the northern
381 end of the road to the west.

382 **Open Space and Trails Map:**

- 383 • R Cecil noted that Hampshire Park is still not colored as a park.
384 • J Paulsen asked about the areas that are shown for future open space. Does the city own that land?
385 • S Bankhead said that the city has not yet acquired that land. However, we are in negotiations to buy some
386 of that land.
387 • G Sonntag said that we should color the future open space yellow to differentiate it from current open
388 space.
389 • J Paulsen asked if Dayton Crites [Cache County Trails Planner] has looked at this map. S Bankhead said
390 that he has.
391 • G Sonntag asked about a designated fire break. S Bankhead said that we have one. The properties in Little
392 Baldy (except for two) have agreed to dedicate the deer fence and the deer fence road for emergency
393 vehicles. The properties up there are in a wildfire hazard area, and so they come in for a conditional use
394 permit, and we talk to them about fire breaks, etc.
395 • G Sonntag asked what effort is being put in to maintain that fire break, such as keeping the brush and
396 woody vegetation down. He asked if anything has been done to help educate homeowners west of the
397 deer fence, who are next to the ravine or undeveloped areas, about what they need to do to protect
398 themselves.
399 • S Bankhead said that Aaron Walker, Logan City Fire Inspector, has been active in getting property owners
400 to maintain fire breaks.

401
402 **Item No. 3. PCC 10-6-1 Use Chart:** Proposed amendments add accessory apartment unit, amend accessory
403 dwelling unit and bed & breakfast.

- 404 • Not discussed

405 **Item No. 4. PCC 10-3-6 Annexation:** Proposed amendments include zoning assigned to a newly annexed area into
406 the City.

- 407 • Not discussed

408
409 **Reports:**

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

- 411 • No staff reports

412
413 **Commission Reports:** Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no
414 formal action will be taken.

- 415 • No staff reports

416
417 **Motion to close the meeting: — B Perry, second—R Cecil**

418 **Vote:**

419 **Yea: L Banda, R Cecil, J Paulsen, B Perry, G Sonntag**

420 **Nay:**

421 **Abstained:**

422 **Excused:**

423
424 Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:10 PM
425 Minutes prepared by Jesse Bardsley
426 Minutes approved by vote of the commission on September 11, 2019
427
428

429
430 _____
Gary Sonntag, Chair

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder