

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**
2 **Providence City Office Building,**
3 **164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332**
4 **December 11, 2019 6:00 p.m.**

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

7 **Roll Call of Commission Members:** Kathleen Alder (voting alternate), Rowan Cecil, Bob Perry

8 **Pledge of Allegiance:** K Alder
9

10 **Approval of the Minutes:**

11 **Item No. 1.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for November 13, 2019.

- 12 • The Commission decided to postpone approval of the minutes because they did not have a voting quorum
13 of members present tonight who attended the November 13 meeting.
- 14 • K Alder referenced the minutes with regards to high density housing. We have many citizens against high
15 density housing. We should be careful [about how we approach high density] as we move forward
16 because many of the younger generation do not want a large home with a large yard. In Salt Lake, a
17 developer is doing micro apartments. We ought to listen to the developers because they are building
18 what people want. We should be careful with how we sell the concept of high density housing.
- 19 • R Cecil agreed. We will have to do it in some places, and so we should do it with care.
20

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

- 26 • Cassidy Recker of 280 North 400 East in Providence said she has lived in Providence her entire life. She
27 addressed the topic of development in Providence, and expressed alarm at the many open spaces that
28 have been converted into housing. She attempted to speak to the City Council last week about the
29 Vineyard development, but was not provided the opportunity. She expressed concern about the lack of
30 infrastructure for these developments, especially roads, which she feels are being underbuilt for the
31 number of new residences. She estimated that Vineyard Phase 2 and 3, which are on the agenda for
32 tonight, would generate around 800 additional car trips per day. The area has very few roads, and the
33 roads are small. She thought that the only egress for the Vineyard subdivision is the road [600 S] that
34 passes by River Heights Elementary School. She would like the Commission to consider asking the
35 developer to provide alternate routes prior to approving the subdivision. This would include a bridge over
36 spring creek. She hopes that the taxpayers of Providence will not have to pay for these improvements.
- 37 • R Cecil said that the parcel near River Heights Elementary School will not be developed until after a
38 referendum vote occurs. There won't be an exit onto that road [with the current development]. R Cecil
39 said that according to a street study that we did, our streets are not overloaded.
- 40 • C Recker said that she is concerned about a large increase in traffic on roads that are not being
41 maintained very well.
- 42 • K Alder asked if C Recker can access that study.
- 43 • S Bankhead said that it is in our impact fee analysis. We are also having another study worked on as we
44 speak.
- 45 • S Bankhead said that she will email C Recker the link for the information.
46

47 **Public Hearing(s):** Remarks during the hearing are limited to 5 minutes per person. The total time allotted to
48 hearing comment is 50 minutes. Persons wishing to address the Commission during public hearing should sign on
49 the sign-in sheet for the public hearing located at the entry to the meeting room. You may also email comments to
50 the City Recorder, sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the day of the meeting. By law, email comments
51 are considered public record and will be shared with all parties involved, including the Planning Commission and
52 the applicant.

- 53 • No public hearings
54

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

58
59 **Administrative - Action Item(s):**

60 **Item No. 1. Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval the final plat for Vineyard
61 Phase 2, a life-cycle residential development containing 15 single-family detached lots and 24 single-family
62 attached units (townhomes), located in the general area of Spring Creek Parkway and 300 East.

63 **Motion to approve the final plat for the Vineyard Phase 2 Life Cycle Residential Development:** — R Cecil, second
64 — K Alder

65 **Vote:**

66 **Yea:** K Alder, R Cecil, B Perry

67 **Nay:**

68 **Abstained:**

69 **Excused:** L Banda, R Holloway, J Paulsen

70 **Discussion:**

- 71 • S Bankhead explained that when the executive staff puts together one of these reports, they look at the
72 general plan principles for residential development, the general plan principles for transportation
73 corridors, etc. We used the Providence City Master Plan 2000 as revised, because that is the one that is
74 approved. S Bankhead read from the staff report.
- 75 • S Bankhead explained that cul-de-sacs are discouraged in our code. They cause cars to have to go out of
76 their way and make extra trips. However, there are some places where they are appropriate.
- 77 • S Bankhead said that connecting Spring Creek Parkway to Gateway Drive will help with east-west traffic
78 flow. The developer is participating in this project.
- 79 • S Bankhead explained that the access that will be on 300 East will only be for emergency vehicles. Some
80 people were concerned about dumping traffic onto 300 East.
- 81 • S Bankhead spoke about groundwater, which was observed in each of the boring holes on the parcel. It
82 fluctuates during the year. The project is in a high water sensitive area, and therefore the city does not
83 recommend basements without a drain system.
- 84 • S Bankhead said that the area covered by buildings, parking spaces, and paved surfaces does not exceed
85 40% of the site, as required in a High Water Table sensitive area in Providence City Code 10-5-5. S
86 Bankhead said that there is a difference between the area that counts for this requirement and the open
87 space that counts for the LCR zone. For the High Water Table sensitive area, this space can include front
88 yards and any area that is not covered with a house or pavement. On the other hand, the open space [for
89 the LCR zone] cannot include private areas like back or front yards.
- 90 • K Alder asked if there is any marshy land on the parcel. S Bankhead said that there is not on this phase.
91 There is a little bit on phase 3. It has been delineated and taken into consideration.
- 92 • S Bankhead said that the staff feels that the final plat meets the requirements in our code. They are
93 recommending it for approval.
- 94 • S Bankhead said that the developer is required to put in the Spring Creek crossing as part of Phase 1.
95 However, they have two years per phase to meet these types of requirements.
- 96 • B Perry asked about the status of the Spring Creek Crossing. S Bankhead said that FEMA may still take up
97 to 30 days to respond.
- 98 • B Perry asked about the ground water. J Paulsen noted at the last meeting that it was found at 8 ft. S
99 Bankhead said that it varies by test hole. She felt it was more appropriate to simply include the log sheet
100 showing where the test holes were drilled and [the depth at which water was found]. The entire site is
101 considered a sensitive area for ground water.
- 102 • B Perry asked about the places where the data is missing for bore holes. Is this a concern? S Bankhead
103 said that it is probably not a concern because we are having them treat the entire site as a sensitive area
104 for ground water anyway. They are mitigating the entire site with a land drain and following the 40/60
105 rule across the entire site.
- 106 • Dallas Nicholl of Visionary Homes spoke about the missing data points. On a site this size, they might
107 normally drill six holes. They drilled much more on this site because they knew they had some opposition
108 and that there was ground water there. The process for drilling these holes involves putting a PVC pipe in

109 the ground and backfilling around it. When the data is missing on the second column, it could mean that
110 the pipe that they put in there got crushed or dirt got in there, which made them unable to collect data [
111 for the second measurement]. We still have a lot of data for this site.

- 112 • D Nicholl said that they have had the geotech out at the site again, and he is still comfortable with moving
113 forward.

114
115 **Item No. 2. Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval the final plat for Vineyard
116 Phase 3, a life-cycle residential development containing 6 single-family detached lots, 15 single-family attached
117 units (townhomes), and 40 single-family attached units (condominiums), located in the general area of 170 East
118 Spring Creek Parkway.

119 **Motion to approve the final plat of Vineyard phase 3: — K Alder, second — R Cecil**

120 **Vote:**

121 **Yea: K Alder, R Cecil, B Perry**

122 **Nay:**

123 **Abstained:**

124 **Excused: L Banda, R Holloway, J Paulsen**

125 Discussion:

- 126
127 • K Alder asked if all of these units will be built on the same lot where the holes were drilled that we just
128 discussed [for the previous business item]. S Bankhead said that this is correct. She explained that phases
129 1-3 are all on the first parcel, which is not the parcel under referendum.
- 130 • S Bankhead spoke about the wetland area that is in the southwest corner of this phase. It is shown in the
131 preliminary plat in the agenda packet (preliminary plat page 2). It is the area outlined in green. The
132 developer has worked with the Army Corps of Engineers, and will be using appropriate mitigation
133 strategies relative to the wetland. The preliminary plat shows that the walking trail follows the wetland
134 border. The wetland will be used as an open space feature.
- 135 • S Bankhead explained that the agreement relative to the sidewalk/trail is not in this phase's development
136 agreement because there is no deviation in the sidewalk on this phase.
- 137 • S Bankhead read from the staff report.
- 138 • B Perry asked about the detention pond on page 3 of the preliminary plat.
- 139 • D Nicholl explained that the difference between detention and retention is that with detention, there is
140 an outlet. Water flows in and then out at a metered rate. In a retention pond, it is held until it evaporates
141 or infiltrates. This detention pond has an outlet into Spring Creek.

142
143
144 **Item No. 3. Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval of the final plat for South
145 Cache Commercial Condominiums Building 8, a three unit commercial condominium building located at 550 West
146 465 N, Providence UT.

147 **Motion to approve the final plat for the South Cache Commercial Condominium Building 8: — R Cecil, second —**
148 **K Alder**

149 **Vote:**

150 **Yea: K Alder, R Cecil, B Perry**

151 **Nay:**

152 **Abstained:**

153 **Excused: L Banda, R Holloway, J Paulsen**

154 Discussion:

- 155 • S Bankhead said that most of this project was approved previously. This is a request to turn one of the
156 buildings into commercial condominiums.
- 157 • S Bankhead read from the staff report. Staff felt that this request meets the requirements of our code.

158
159 **Item No. 4. Planning Commission Bylaws Proposed Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will
160 consider for recommendation to City Council a proposed amendment adding training requirements to the Planning
161 Commission Bylaws.

162 **Motion to approve the bylaw amendment for training of new Planning Commission members and the**
163 **appointment of a training person: — K Alder, second — R Cecil**

164 **Vote:**

165 **Yea: K Alder, R Cecil, B Perry**

166 **Nay:**

167 **Abstained**

168 **Excused: L Banda, R Holloway, J Paulsen**

169 Discussion:

- 170 • B Perry said that this has been discussed in executive staff and our city attorney agrees with the wording.
- 171 • S Bankhead noted that the most recent version of this amendment has one more sentence than what is
- 172 shown in the agenda packet: "The Planning Commission chair will appoint a training person to keep track
- 173 of the training."
- 174 • K Alder asked if Land Use 101 is the only thing that we are requiring.
- 175 • B Perry said that Land Use 101 covers the open meetings law, some general plan issues, ethics, conflicts of
- 176 interest, etc.
- 177 • K Alder asked about the cost.
- 178 • S Bankhead said that if there is a cost, it is covered by the city. The Land Use 101 training is free. There is
- 179 also a training by the Utah League of Cities and Towns at their conferences. With out-of-town
- 180 conferences, we reimburse Planning Commission members after they have signed up and paid for
- 181 themselves. We also reimburse travel expenses after the fact.
- 182

183 **Study Items(s):**

184 **Item No. 4. PCC 10-8-1, 2, & 3 Set Backs:** Proposed amendments make changes to the setback requirements.

185

186 The Commission discussed the front setbacks for primary structures.

- 187 • B Perry said that he is in favor of a 20 ft front setback for all zones. R Cecil agreed. K Alder agreed.
- 188 • **Change: The Commission decided to make 20 ft the front setback for all Single Family zones.**
- 189 • K Alder said that consistency is easier to administer. She felt that 20 ft doesn't create problems and that it
- 190 looks fine.
- 191 • S Bankhead said that the Commission is establishing the minimum setback requirements. Someone can
- 192 set their house back more if they want to.
- 193 • R Cecil said that he doesn't see any reason to require larger setbacks on larger lots.

194

195 The Commission discussed side yard interior setbacks for primary structures.

- 196 • B Perry suggested 10 ft across all Single Family zones. K Alder agreed.
- 197 • B Perry asked S Bankhead if there would be a problem with this setback in the Single Family High or Single
- 198 Mobile Home zones.
- 199 • S Bankhead said that what is shown on the chart actually means that one side has to be 10 ft and one side
- 200 can be 5 ft [in the SFH and SMH zones]. The house next to the house with the 5 ft setback must have a 10
- 201 ft setback (for a total setback between the houses of 15 ft). Changing both side setbacks to 10 ft will not
- 202 be a problem. The 5 ft/10 ft rule was difficult in some ways.
- 203 • K Alder asked about odd shaped lots. S Bankhead said that the plat designer will have to take that into
- 204 account. There must be a buildable envelope on each lot.
- 205 • R Cecil felt that 10 ft on each side won't work for developments like the Champlin senior living project.
- 206 There won't be room for the houses.
- 207 • S Bankhead said that taking away 5 ft [by increasing the setback] could potentially affect a developer who
- 208 is trying to maximize the number of lots he can get. We have not seen anything formal from the Champlin
- 209 development.
- 210 • B Perry asked if a developer could get a variance.
- 211 • S Bankhead said that it would be difficult for the Appeal Authority to grant such a variance because the
- 212 developer needs to design the development according to the rules. If there were an unusual feature, such
- 213 as a creek, that might qualify for a variance.
- 214 • R Cecil suggested a 7.5 ft side setback.

- 215
- 216
- 217
- 218
- 219
- 220
- 221
- 222
- 223
- 224
- K Alder asked why the current requirement is for 10 ft on one side and 5 ft on the other. Is it for emergency services?
 - S Bankhead said that was one of the things that [the staff] looked at. However, with fences, the emergency services won't have that much room anyway. S Bankhead also said that with a 5 ft setback, if someone encroaches on it, then you have less than 5 ft, which isn't acceptable for walking around the house. She said that 7.5 ft could work.
 - R Snow said that 15 ft is a good separation to prevent fires from spreading.
 - Change: The Commission decided to make the interior side setback 7.5 ft for Single Family High and Single Mobile Home zones. The other [single family] zones will have a 10 ft side setback.

225 The Commission discussed the side yard street setback for primary structures.

- 226
- 227
- 228
- 229
- 230
- B Perry suggested making some zones 20 ft and some zones 15 ft.
 - Change: R Cecil suggested making the side yard street setback for all zones except Single Family High and Single Mobile Home 20 ft and making the aforementioned two zones 15 ft. The Commission decided to accept this suggestion.

231 The Commission discussed rear yard setbacks for primary structures.

- 232
- 233
- 234
- 235
- 236
- 237
- B Perry suggested 15 ft across all zones.
 - K Alder asked if this affects accessory dwelling units.
 - S Bankhead said that the setbacks we are currently discussing are for the principle units, not accessory units.
 - Change: The Commission decided that all [single family] zones should have a 15 ft rear yard setback.

238 The Commission discussed front yard setbacks for detached accessory dwelling units.

- 239
- 240
- 241
- 242
- Change: R Cecil and B Perry suggested 20 ft for all zones. The Commission decided to accept this suggestion.
 - S Bankhead said that the carets that are shown on the chart were supposed to have been deleted.

243 The Commission discussed the side yard interior setback for detached accessory dwelling units.

- 244
- 245
- 246
- 247
- 248
- 249
- 250
- 251
- 252
- 253
- 254
- 255
- 256
- S Bankhead said that the side yard interior refers to two lots that are next to each other as opposed to a lot that is next to a city right-of-way.
 - R Cecil asked why we would do a different setback for an accessory dwelling unit than for the principle structure.
 - S Bankhead said that the current ordinance for accessory dwelling units says that they will follow the setbacks for the principal use. In previous discussions of the Commission, there was at least one member who felt like accessory dwelling units should have their own setbacks. They felt like maybe the setbacks for accessory dwelling units should be even more restrictive than the principle use. That is why we have this new section in the chart for accessory dwelling units. If the Commission decides to give ADUs different setbacks from the principal use, we would have to go back and change the accessory dwelling unit ordinance.
 - K Alder felt that we should be consistent.

257 The Commission discussed side yard street setbacks for detached accessory dwelling units.

- 258
- 259
- 260
- Change: The Commission decided to do 20 ft in all zones except Single Family High and Single Mobile Home, and to do 15 ft in the aforementioned zones.

261 The Commission discussed the rear yard setback for detached accessory dwelling units.

- 262
- 263
- 264
- 265
- 266
- 267
- Change: The Commission decided to do a 15 ft rear yard setback in all zones except Single Mobile Home, and to do a 10 ft rear setback in that zone.
 - R Snow asked why we have a separate section for detached accessory dwelling units on the chart when we have followed the same setbacks as the primary structure.
 - B Perry said that we had a Commission member that wanted separate setbacks for the accessory dwelling units. We can eliminate this section if it is the same as the primary structure.

- 268
- 269
- 270
- 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
- R Snow asked about the front setback (from the street). Does the Commission want the accessory dwelling to be side by side with the primary dwelling unit, or do they want it to be offset behind? Do they care where it is on the lot? What do they want it to look like visually?
 - S Bankhead said that we do have a property on which a detached accessory dwelling unit is being proposed to go [next to] the house. The property has its longer edge along the street side. Is the commission OK with the appearance of having two homes next to each other? Or do they want them to be offset?
 - R Snow asked if the Commission members want the [the public] to be able to recognize that it is an accessory dwelling unit. Do they care if it looks like two houses side by side on a lot? It is an aesthetic question. Staff will not give a recommendation on this, but the Commission may want to consider it.
 - S Bankhead clarified that [according to our current code], the accessory dwelling unit would need to be no larger than 50% of the primary structure, or [1200] square feet, whichever is less. It couldn't quite look like two identical houses.
 - S Bankhead said that there is a section in the accessory dwelling unit ordinance that says that the architecture of the ADU should be similar to the architecture of the primary residence.
 - R Cecil felt that an additional setback from the house is not necessary.
 - K Alder agreed. She didn't feel like it looks bad to have a house and an ADU side by side.
 - K Alder asked about the minimum distance between the house and the ADU.
 - S Bankhead said that distance between residential structures on the same lot is defined on page 2 of the Area Regulations chart. We also look to the building code. If the structures are built appropriately, they can be right next to each other. If the commission would like a separation, they should define that on the chart.
 - B Perry said that we can make changes to these setbacks in a few years if we get additional information.
 - R Snow said that if we change the code too often, it can cause problems for developers who need to draw their plans based on city requirements. If they haven't started building yet, they will have to adjust to the new setbacks.
 - K Alder said that if we change our requirements, it will create an inconsistent look. She also felt that there will not be very many ADUs. She asked S Bankhead and R Snow if there a reason that an ADU needs to be a certain distance from a house.
 - R Snow said that if the distance between the ADU and the main house maintains the same setback as the main house has [from the side yard], then if the property ever splits, the two structures would meet setback requirements.
 - K Alder said that if we want to follow R Snow's suggestion, we would need to have a distance between the buildings of 20 ft.
 - R Snow said that this is true if the Commission foresees the lots splitting. However, if the Commission doesn't want the lots to split, they may want to design the ADU code with a smaller required distance in order to prevent the lots from splitting.
 - S Bankhead said that having an increased required distance between buildings may limit the number of lots that can have an accessory dwelling unit. This may or may not be what the Commission wants to do.
 - R Snow said that if the ADU were placed behind the main house, we would need a 35 ft separation for the lot to be able to be split.
 - K Alder said that if people anticipate splitting their lot someday, we can tell them to build the accessory dwelling unit to the appropriate setbacks. We don't need to make them do that.
 - K Alder said that we wouldn't want the lots to split if the ADU were in the rear yard. That would create a flag lot. If they are side by side, they could split it. We should make the distance between the house and the ADU 20 ft if they are side by side.
 - S Bankhead said that we recently changed our code to allow flag lots in the downtown area [the only area where they were previously prohibited].
 - S Bankhead said that just because there is 20 ft between the house and the ADU doesn't mean that they can split the lot. Our zones also have lot size requirements. In a Single Family Traditional zone, each lot needs to have at least 12,000 square feet. However, it is possible that in the future the City Council could rezone that area to a smaller minimum lot size. Then the setbacks might become a bigger issue.
 - R Cecil said that some people might want to have the ADU closer to their house so that they can go easily between the ADU and the house.

- 322 • B Perry said that would be good if relatives lived in the ADU, but otherwise they might want more space
- 323 between them.
- 324 • R Cecil said that in the future, it is likely that the area behind the houses on some of the big lots in
- 325 Providence will be used for housing.
- 326 • Change: R Cecil suggested making the distance between residential structures on a lot 15 ft across all
- 327 zones. The Commission accepted this suggestion, but they changed the Single Mobile Home zone to 10 ft.
- 328 • S Bankhead brought up the maximum heights listed in the Area Regulations chart. Staff suggested 50 ft be
- 329 the maximum height for MFM, MFH, CGD, CHD, MXD, PUB, and REC zones. Previously, we didn't have a
- 330 maximum height.
- 331 • Change: The Commission decided to accept the maximum height suggestions from staff, but changed the
- 332 MFR zone to 45 ft (the latter decision was made later on in the meeting).
- 333 • R Cecil asked why staff suggested that MFR have a maximum height of 35 ft instead of 50 ft.
- 334 • S Bankhead said that staff was thinking about maintaining the look and feel of certain areas of the city. 35
- 335 ft would allow multi-family units to fit in with single family residences. Multi family residential is a zone
- 336 that we have thought about using as a transition between multi family areas and single family areas.
- 337 • R Cecil suggested 40 ft for the MFR zone. He would like there to be able to be 3 stories.
- 338 • K Alder felt that residents might accept the MFR zone better if it was limited to 35 feet in height so as to
- 339 blend with houses.
- 340 • Change: S Bankhead said that the MXD zone on the chart should probably have 45 ft as a maximum
- 341 height, since that is what it says in the MXD ordinance. The Commission agreed.
- 342 • The Commission decided to set the maximum height for the MFR zone to 45 ft for both the principal and
- 343 accessory use.
- 344 • K Alder asked about the added text on page 5 of the setback ordinance.
- 345 • S Bankhead said that this is mostly about what can extend into a setback.
- 346 • S Bankhead said that the purple text on page 7 was approved by an ordinance previously. We
- 347 inadvertently left it out of the code.
- 348 • K Alder asked about 10-8-3 C(9). Did our changes to the chart affect the provision about different sized
- 349 side yards for residential structures taller than 45 ft?
- 350 • S Bankhead said that this section is saying that those structures have a different side yard than what is
- 351 shown on the chart. It is easier to say it in this section of the code than on the chart.
- 352 • R Cecil asked if we need to hold a public hearing for these changes. S Bankhead said that the Commission
- 353 already held a public hearing.
- 354 • S Bankhead said that this is a study item. It will come before the Commission one more time [as an action
- 355 item].
- 356 • B Perry asked that this come back to the Commission as an action item at the next meeting.
- 357 • B Perry asked if there will be anything that the Commission may need to address in another meeting in
- 358 December. S Bankhead said that she does not foresee anything. The next meeting is scheduled for January
- 359 8th.

361 **Reports:**

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

- 363 • R Snow said that the Commission could consider meeting one time per month. They would plan for all
- 364 action items at this meeting, and then if something came up to require a second meeting, they could plan
- 365 one. He felt that this leads to efficiency in the meetings.
- 366 • B Perry said that in the past, two meetings per month has fit their work load.
- 367 • S Bankhead said that if there is enough work load, a second meeting can always be scheduled.
- 368 • R Cecil said that around May, the Commissions starts to get inundated with [business items]. Rather than
- 369 having the meeting go until 11:00 PM, he would prefer two meetings per month.
- 370 • R Snow suggested scheduling two meetings from May-September.
- 371 • R Cecil said it should go through October.
- 372 • R Cecil said that we should look at the work load and decide based on that.

- 373
- 374
- 375
- 376
- 377
- 378
- 379
- 380
- 381
- 382
- 383
- 384
- 385
- 386
- 387
- 388
- 389
- 390
- 391
- 392
- 393
- 394
- K Alder said that she likes the flexibility of being able to say that we don't need a second meeting [during a given month]. If we only have one meeting scheduled at first, then we don't have to cancel the other if we don't need it.
 - S Bankhead said that one thing this would do is allow the city staff to focus developers on the meeting that is "for sure." If we have two meetings per month and try to cancel one of them, we may not be able to cancel if a developer/applicant has applied for something within the required time frames. Even if they are the only item on that meeting agenda, we may not be able to cancel that meeting.
 - B Perry asked if this would put more workload on city staff.
 - S Bankhead said that having one meeting per month would give us extra time to prepare for that meeting. Also, if staff really felt like something shouldn't be delayed, they could contact the Planning Commission chair and request a second meeting.
 - S Bankhead said that with one meeting per month, the Commissioners would also know that the "for sure" meeting was the most important one to attend.
 - R Snow said that in his experience, focusing on one meeting per month makes it more likely that a full committee will be present. It also reduces some staff work load.
 - K Alder and B Perry were willing to give it a try.
 - R Cecil said that sometimes meetings take a long time because of a lot of public input.
 - S Bankhead said that if the Commission knew that a controversial issue was coming up, they could reserve the first meeting for the public hearings and then schedule a second meeting for other items.
 - R Snow said that the Commission could then have a meeting that is focused only on the public hearing. Then you don't have public clamor on every issue.

395 S Bankhead, Administrative Services Director

- The City Council approved the development agreements for Vineyard Phase 2 and 3. They also approved the code amendment on Planned Unit Development and Inner Block Development.
- The City Council approved the rezone of the miniature golf parcel to Multi Family High despite the Commission's recommendation to deny it.
- The City Council discussed the general plan maps. They took many of the Commission's recommendations.
- B Perry asked how well the Commission did on the general plan. Did they take too long?
- S Bankhead said that at the beginning of the general plan process, the feedback that we got from the open houses, steering committee, stakeholder groups, etc., was more friendly to higher density and preserving open space. About two years into the process, there was a lot of public clamor against density. The Planning Commission at the time started to rethink the general plan without knowing all that had gone on in the two years before. This caused things to take more time.

408

409

410 **Commission Reports:** Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no

411 formal action will be taken.

412

413

414 **Motion to close the meeting:** — R Cecil, second — K Alder

415

416 Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:25 PM

417 Minutes prepared by Jesse Bardsley

418

419

420 _____

421 Bob Perry, Chair

420 _____

421 Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder