

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Minutes**

2 **Providence City Office Building,**

3 **164 North Gateway Drive,**

4 **Providence UT 84332**

5 **January 22, 2020 6:00 p.m.**

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

8 **Roll Call of Commission Members:** Bob Perry

9 **Attendance:** Kathleen Alder, Laura Banda, Alex Bearson (alternate), Rowan Cecil, Michael Fortune (alternate),
10 Ruth Ann Holloway, Bob Perry

11 **Excused:** None

12 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Bob Perry

13
14 **Oath of Office and Introduction of Newly Appointed Members:** Bob Perry, Chair, will introduce Alex Bearson and
15 Michael Fortune, and they will take the oath of office.

- 16 • Michael Fortune and Alex Bearson were sworn in.
- 17 • B Perry reminded the new alternates about the training that they will be expected to attend. He asked
18 them to email K Alder when they complete the training.

19
20 **Approval of the Minutes:**

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

22 **Motion to approve the minutes of November 13, 2019:** — R Cecil, second — L Banda

23 **Vote:**

24 **Yea:** L Banda, R Cecil, R Holloway, B Perry

25 **Nay:**

26 **Abstained:** K Alder

27 **Excused:**

28 **Corrections:**

- 29 • Line 243: S Bankhead said
- 30 • Line 366: explained said
- 31 • K Alder was excused during this meeting

32
33 **Item No. 2.** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for December 11, 2019.

34 **Motion to approve the minutes of December 11, 2019:** — R Cecil, second — R Holloway

35 **Vote:**

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

37 **Nay:**

38 **Abstained:** R Holloway, L Banda

39 **Corrections:**

- 40 • Remove highlighted parts
- 41 • Line 275: extra the
- 42 • Line 295: if there is a reason
- 43 • B Perry asked city staff to put a list of who was present and who was absent/excused in the minutes in the
44 future.

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

- 51 • No public comments.

52
53 **Public Hearing(s):** Remarks during the hearing are limited to 5 minutes per person. The total time allotted to
54 hearing comment is 50 minutes. Persons wishing to address the Commission during public hearing should sign on

55 the sign-in sheet for the public hearing located at the entry to the meeting room. You may also email comments to
56 the City Recorder, sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the day of the meeting. By law, email comments
57 are considered public record and will be shared with all parties involved, including the Planning Commission and
58 the applicant.

- 59 • No public comments.

60
61 **Public Hearing(s):**

62 **Item No. 1. Code Amendment 6:10 p.m.:** Prior to making a recommendation on the proposed code amendment
63 to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations, Section 1 Area Regulations and
64 Section 3 Setbacks, the Planning Commission is holding a public hearing. The purpose of the public hearing is to
65 provide an opportunity for anyone interested to comment on the proposal before action is taken. The Planning
66 Commission invites you to attend the hearing in order to offer your comments. You may also email comments to
67 the City Recorder, sbankhead@providence.utah.gov by 2:00 PM the day of the meeting. By law, email comments
68 are considered public record and will be shared with all parties involved, including the Planning Commission and
69 the applicant.

- 70 • No public comments.

71
72 **Action Item Note:** Should the Planning Commission not be able to make a decision or take exception to an Action
73 Item(s), then that item will be tabled and revert back to a study category. The applicant will have 15 minutes to
74 introduce and make a brief presentation.

75
76 **Legislative – Action Item(s):**

77 **Item No. 1. Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for recommendation to the City
78 Council proposed amendments to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations,
79 Section 1 Area Regulations and Section 3 Setbacks

80 **Motion to recommend to the City Council the proposed amendments to Providence City Code Title 10 Zoning**
81 **Regulations, Chapter 8 Area Regulations, Section 1 Area Regulations and Section 3 Setbacks: — R Cecil, second**
82 **— L Banda**

83 **Vote:**

84 **Yea: K Alder, L Banda, R Cecil, R Holloway, B Perry**

85 **Nay:**

86 **Abstained:**

87 **Excused:**

88 **Discussion:**

- 89 • R Cecil noted that what is in the agenda packet reflects what the commission decided at the last meeting.

90
91 **Study Items(s):**

92 **Item No. 1. Street Cross-Sections:** The Planning Commission will review the street cross-section options and partial
93 streets.

- 94 • S Bankhead explained the history surrounding 2100 South, which resulted in the use of a partial road.
95 After much discussion with the City, the developer modified their plat so that they could accommodate a
96 partial road. We do have in [our standards and specifications] the ability to build a partial road. A partial
97 road means that on the developer's side, they will put the full sidewalk, the full park strip, the full curb
98 and gutter, and 24 ft of asphalt. This allows for two travel lanes. The question we are bringing up is
99 whether partial streets should be allowed at all in Providence. We could ban them completely and insist
100 that developers build a full-width street. Or, we could change our partial street cross-section to include a
101 full width of asphalt and curb and gutter on both sides. The only thing this would leave for the next
102 developer would be the park strip and the sidewalk.
- 103 • B Perry asked if this discussion applies to 500 South. S Bankhead said that 500 South has a very large right-
104 of-way. The Champlin development has to accommodate the width of the right-of-way, but they do not
105 have to build the entire width of the road.
- 106 • B Perry brought up 100 South west of the roundabout. S Bankhead that this is considered a partial road.
- 107 • B Perry brought up the proposed road that would go behind [Discount Tire]. S Bankhead said that it is
108 proposed as a [50 ft] right-of-way. Currently, the part of the road behind Discount Tire is only partially
109 complete because it has no sidewalk or park strip.

- 110 • R Snow said that there are a few things to consider about a partial road. He discussed the differences in
- 111 cost between a 24 ft road and a 30 ft road, etc. We should consider how much it would cost the developer
- 112 to always put in a full road, and how much it would cost the city to come finish a partial road if
- 113 development never happens on the other side.
- 114 • R Snow said that sometimes in counties, the residents own to the middle of the street. With a partial
- 115 street, the developer is building a driveable road that doesn't have curb and gutter on one side.
- 116 • B Perry brought up the Champlin development and the road that will be built through it.
- 117 • S Bankhead said that the City will have to look at that road as part of the development process. The City
- 118 might allow the developer to shift the road a little so that he can have homes on either side.
- 119 • K Alder said that in cases where we know that nobody else will come develop the other side of that road
- 120 (such as with Ballard Springs), we should require it to have curb and gutter on both sides.
- 121 • S Bankhead said that we discussed that issue with the annexation of that property. She said that we
- 122 consider these roads on a case by case basis. Sometimes, if the City is asking the developer to build more
- 123 road than the impact the developer is bringing to the City, the City will work with the developer to finish
- 124 the road. With annexations, we can ask for more.
- 125 • S Bankhead said that the partial road cross section is currently in use. The Planning Commission is being
- 126 asked to considering whether to continue to allow it, whether it should be altered, etc.
- 127 • R Holloway expressed concern about public safety at the unfinished edge of a partial road. Especially if it
- 128 is next to a waterway, this could pose a danger.
- 129 • S Bankhead said that sometimes the City requires developers to do a full-size road if there is a reason for
- 130 that.
- 131 • R Snow said that the question is whether we want to keep the partial street cross-section as an option, or
- 132 change it, or eliminate it completely.
- 133 • S Bankhead said that on the unfinished side of the partial road, the developer has to level out the
- 134 shoulder. It doesn't just end abruptly.
- 135 • L Banda said that she is worried about having two sets of policies: one for times when future development
- 136 on the other side of the road is feasible, and one where it is not. It is best to have a consistent policy.
- 137 • R Cecil felt that we will need the partial street cross sections. We will just have to decide in which cases it
- 138 is appropriate.
- 139 • K Alder asked if the partial street cross section has been working. Is there a reason to change it?
- 140 • R Snow said that it was brought up at the last Council meeting by the property owners around 2100
- 141 South. Land use items should be discussed by the Planning Commission first [before going to the Council].
- 142 • S Bankhead said that because the Planning Commission approves the subdivision plats, the Commission
- 143 will know when we use a partial road. It is not common because most of the time developers want to put
- 144 homes on both sides of their infrastructure.
- 145 • R Cecil felt that we should leave it the way it is.
- 146 • A Bearson said that from a developer standpoint, [the partial street option] is great, although it is not
- 147 the best aesthetically. He felt that it encourages faster development and is a good policy.
- 148 • K Alder asked if other local cities use this policy. K Alder felt that we should leave it the way it is if there is
- 149 no problem with it.
- 150 • R Holloway agreed. She felt that the policy leaves a bit of flexibility. She appreciated knowing that the
- 151 unfinished shoulder is not just a drop-off.
- 152 • A Bearson said that if the other side of the road is developed, we have a tax base to maintain it, plow it,
- 153 etc. If it is not developed, having a partial road [allows us to wait before we have to pay for the
- 154 maintenance].
- 155 • L Banda was concerned about smaller roads because there is less space for parking. She would be in favor
- 156 of requiring both sides to be finished.
- 157 • M Fortune said that he has had experience from both sides of this issue. Most developments try to
- 158 maximize their [land] and have development on both sides of the road. There are times when you come
- 159 across areas where the existing people don't want their side of the road to be finished. It is also very
- 160 expensive for the developer to finish both sides of the roadway. Making the developer do the other side
- 161 [when they are not developing it] it might be too much of a financial burden for them. M Fortune felt that
- 162 the current cross-section is a good plan to have for situations where a partial road is needed.
- 163 • B Perry felt that we should discuss it again at the next meeting.

- 164
- L Banda asked what the minimum width would be if we wanted to accommodate parking on one side.
 - R Snows said that cars are typically about 8 ft wide. A 32 ft road could accommodate one lane of parked cars and two lanes of travel.
- 165
166
167

168 **Reports:**

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

- 170
- B Perry asked if we are going to one meeting per month.
 - S Bankhead said that one meeting per month will probably work right now. This is the slowest we have been as far as development for about 6 years. A lot of our developments are in process already. This is a time when the market is looking for a variety of options, but people are not comfortable with all the options. Some people are waiting on development.
 - B Perry said that we should plan on meeting Feb 12.
 - R Snow recommended holding the meeting on the second Wednesday so that it can be [the week before] Council meeting.
- 171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178

179 Skarlet Bankhead, Administrative Services Director

- We met with the developer of the Champlin property. They submitted a plan that had too many lots, so they need to revise their plan.
 - S Bankhead explained that we compensate our Planning Commission members. The members receive compensation for the meetings they show up to. Members are not eligible for retirement. New members will have to fill out a form stating that they understand that they are not eligible for retirement.
 - S Bankhead said that we want to be very up front with people about conflicts of interest. Even if a member has put something on a disclosure sheet, it doesn't relieve them from the obligation to disclose the conflict publicly during a meeting if it comes up.
- 180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188

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

190

191

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

193 **Yea: K Alder, L Banda, R Cecil, R Holloway, B Perry**

194 **Nay:**

195 **Abstained:**

196 **Excused:**

197 Meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM

198 Minutes prepared by Jesse Bardsley

199 Minutes approved by vote of the Commission on February 12, 2020

200
201
202

203 _____
Bob Perry, Chair

Skarlet Bankhead, City Recorder