

1 **PROVIDENCE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, September 8, 2021 6:00 pm

3 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Dr., Providence Utah

4

5 For a more complete and accurate account of the Planning Commission Meeting please view our

6 YouTube video of the meeting that can be found on Providence City's YouTube channel:

7 [Planning Commission Meeting 9-8-21](#) ctrl+click to follow link

8

9 **Hr. Min. Sec.** in **GREEN** above agenda items are time stamps for the YouTube Video of the meeting.

10

11 **Call to Order:** Kathleen Alder

12 **Chair Roll Call of Commission Members:** Joe Chambers, Tyler Riggs, Michael Fortune, Robert Perry, Rowan Cecil,
13 and Brian Marble

14 **Excused:** None

15 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Michael Fortune

16

17 **Approval of Minutes:** No minutes to approve.

18

19 **1 Min. 30 Sec.**

20 **Public Comments:** Citizens may express their views on issues within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction. The
21 Commission accepts comments: in-person, by email providencecityutah@gmail.com, and by text
22 435-752-9441. By law, email comments are considered public record and will be shared with all
23 parties involved, including the Planning Commission and the applicant.

- No public comments.

24

25

26 **Public Hearing(s):**

- 27
- 28 ➤ **Item No. 1 Partial Rezone of Parcel 02-144-0042:** The Planning Commission will take comments
29 and questions regarding the application filed by Cannon & Nisha Perry, to rezone a section of parcel 02-
30 144-0042 generally located at 177 W 150 N. Petition seeks to rezone a section of the parcel from Single-
31 Family Residential (SFR) to Multi-Family Medium (MFM).
32 ○ This item was taken off the agenda.

33

34

35 **Legislative Action Item(s):**

- 36
- 37 ➤ **Item No. 2 Parcel 02-144-0042 Partial Rezone:** The Planning Commission will review and may
38 make a recommendation to the City Council on a request from Cannon & Nisha Parry to change the zone
39 of a portion of parcel 02-144-0042, generally located at 177 W 150 N from Single-Family Residential (SFR)
40 to Multi-Family Medium (MFM). **(EXHIBIT)**
41 ○ This item was taken off the agenda.

42

43 **2 Min. 55 Sec.**

- 44 ➤ **Item No. 3 Design Standards for Attached and Multi-Family Residential Development:**
45 Providence City Planning Commission will consider and may recommend to the Providence City Council
46 the proposed amendments to the City Code Title 10 Chapter 8 Section 9: Design standards for attached
47 and multi-family residential development. *This was brought before City Council on 7/21 and sent back to
48 Planning Commission with recommendations. **Tabled last PC Mtg for further discussion. **(EXHIBIT)**

- 49 ○ S Bankhead explains the difference between single family attached and multi-family units. Single
- 50 family attached are things like town homes where a unit is sold to a single family, but they are all
- 51 attached to one building.
- 52 ○ S Bankhead went over feasible building.
- 53 ○ R Snow asked how to push it with 30 % of the units complete.
- 54 ○ R Snow and S Bankhead brought up amenities and the sidewalk and a discussion followed.
- 55 ○ Parking as a problem and parking in the driveway was mentioned and the problem was
- 56 discussed.
- 57 ○ S Bankhead went over different ways the situation could be handled but it depended on if they
- 58 wanted a two car garage or two car parking outside of the garage.
- 59 ○ R Snow brought up grade siding and talked about a two car parking with 16 width depth.
- 60 ○ Vinyl was pointed out and talked about for building. The standards for different materials were
- 61 discussed.
- 62

63 ***Motion to table Item No. 3 until the revisions are written up and the design is more clear: — B Marble, R Perry***

64 ***Vote:***

65 ***Yea: K Alder, M Fortune, R Cecil, T Riggs, J Chambers***

66 ***Nay:***

67 ***Abstained:***

68

69 **Administrative Action Item(s):**

70

71 **1 Hr. 8 Min. 25 Sec.**

- 72 ➤ **Item No. 4 3-Lot Residential Inner Block Development:** The Planning Commission will consider
- 73 and may take action on a special review request by Christi Larsen for a 3-lot residential inner block
- 74 development located in the general area of 150 E 200 S. *Item was tabled last PC Mtg for further review
- 75 and discussion. [\(CONCEPT PLAN ANALYSIS\)](#)
- 76 ○ S Bankhead said C Larsen could still do the block development with all 3 lots but asked are
- 77 there things that would need to be added or changed to the development.
- 78 ○ The property access was discussed, and it was brought up that it had been in the conditions to
- 79 not use access through peacock lane. Two of the spaces would have to share a road because
- 80 only two of the lots have accesses.
- 81 ○ There was a discussion as well to have the addresses posted up above the access or accesses
- 82 for other vehicles such as the postman or firetruck to be able to find easily.
- 83 ○ J Chambers brought up concerns about blocking the access road and said there was not a place
- 84 for the mailbox. There was a discussion about a possible community mailbox.
- 85 ○ There was more discussion on the driveway and if they needed to make it wider since it might
- 86 be shared etc. There was also concern about having two private roads.
- 87

88 ***Motion that we establish the following conditions for the free lot residential inner block development located in***

89 ***the general area of 150 East 200 South, those conditions are as follows: Establishing a maintenance obligation***

90 ***agreement, requiring street access for the shared access, requiring street access from road to property line and***

91 ***asphalt, and a dedicated access to each property and there can be one or two but the two must be a shared***

92 ***access because by ordinance it's only two people. The condition for street signage or house numbers and***

93 ***conditions for lighting in the inner block area to reduce for emergency vehicle access. Under the condition of***

94 ***requiring the street access, must meet city standards and subject to Finding of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and***

95 ***Conditions: — M Fortune, Second —R Cecil***

96 ***Vote:***

97 ***Yea: K Alder, T Riggs, J Chambers, R Perry***

98 **Nay: B Marble**

99 **Abstained:**

100

101 **1 Hr. 52 Min. 40 Sec.**

- 102 ➤ **Item No. 5 Ironwood Construction Concept Plan:** The Planning Commission will consider and
103 may take action on a request from Ironwood Construction for approval of a concept plan for Fox Hollow, a
104 60-unit townhome development located in the general area of 590 W 300 S Providence UT. [\(EXHIBIT\)](#)
- 105 ○ S Bankhead said we're looking at a multi concept approval because it is a multi-family approval.
106 She read from the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions from the Staff Report.
 - 107 ○ S Bankhead brings up that there might be an assured parks and trails future trail up ahead. That
108 it is being looked at. It would be done in private and is not a dedicated public trail at this point.
109 She said they need to identify the play area.
 - 110 ○ S Bankhead said they will be phasing this and that the fire marshal, Aaron Walker has approved
111 as far as fire access goes. The north portion will be done with phase one and after phase two,
112 with the streaming, they can complete the development.
 - 113 ○ Dan Justin Tuspian with Ironwood Construction comments. They added that they are wanting to
114 do a little bit wider and larger unit, a good sellable unit. Play and recreational areas for families;
115 still mulling over other amenities. Small things like bike racks etc.
 - 116 ○ B Marble brought up that it might be 24 units. A discussion followed about the communities,
117 cooperation, and traffic. There will be 27 Lots. The roads and a turn around were discussed in
118 length.
 - 119 ○ R Snow pointed out that they absolutely must have access over that point in the water. He
120 explained the situation over the flow of the city sewer. He also talked about property tax and
121 how the residents would have questions about that.

122

123 **Motion that the Planning Commission approve the request by the Ironwood Construction for a concept plan for**
124 **the Fox Hollow town home development located in the general area of 590 West and 300 South with the**
125 **conditions listed in our meeting with the Finding of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions listed in the**
126 **meeting: — R Cecil, Second —M Fortune**

127 **Vote:**

128 **Yea: K Alder, M Fortune, R Cecil, T Riggs, J Chambers**

129 **Nay:**

130 **Abstained:**

131

132 **2 Hr. 29 Min. 20 Sec.**

- 133 ➤ **Item No. 6 Sunrise Acres Amended Final Plat:** The Planning Commission will consider and may
134 take action on a request from Robert Brown to amend the final plat for Sun Rise Acres 2 and Sun Rise
135 Acres 3 by combining Sun Rise Acres 2 Lot 4 and Sun Rise Acres 3 Lot 8 and removing the public
136 utility easement between the two lots, located at 638 S and 646 South 330 W, Providence. [\(EXHIBIT\)](#)
- 137 ○ S Bankhead read from the overview explaining the project and the staff report.
 - 138 ○ R Snow asked if they were going to be installing a sidewalk, and Robert Brown from Providence
139 City said the sidewalks have already been installed.

140

141 **Motion that we amend the final plat for the public utilities; parcel number: 0220202042020308 located in the**
142 **area 638 south, 630 west, 646 south, 330 west to include the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions:**
143 **— R Perry, Second —R Cecil**

144 **Vote:**

145 **Yea: K Alder, M Fortune, R Cecil, T Riggs, J Chambers**

146 **Nay:**

147 **Abstained:**

148

149 **Study Items(s):**

150

151 ➤ **Item No. 7 PCC 2-5 Appeal Authority Code Amendment: (EXHIBIT)** Planning Commission to
152 consider and may take action on changing from a 3 member, with 2 alternate members appeal board, to
153 an administrative appeals hearing officer/s.

154 ○ S Bankhead explained the Code Amendment and how Planning Commission works in different
155 areas. She read the Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions. She said the main
156 thing to consider on this was to change from a commission or a body to an administrative
157 appeals officer.

158 ○ There was a discussion among the Planning Commission about the pros and cons of having a
159 group do the planning as opposed to one person having the authority. J Chambers told about his
160 past experience.

161

162 ***Item tabled until next meeting. No Motion necessary as item is a study item.***

163

164 **2 Hr. 54 Min.**

165 ➤ **Item No. 8 PCC 10-5 Sensitive Areas Code Amendment:** Planning Commission to consider and
166 may take action on changing from a conditional use to reviews through the subdivision/development
167 process, the building permit process, and engineering reviews. (EXHIBIT)

168 ○ S Bankhead reads from the Code book? to explain the Conditional use process that is used every
169 time there is a sensitive land area or a slope, even though the mitigation process is the same.

170

171 ***Item tabled until next meeting. No Motion necessary as item is a study item.***

172 ***Motion to adjourn: — Rowan Cecil, Second —M Fortune***

173

174 Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:07 PM

175 Minutes prepared by Kris Hobbs Clemente

176

177

178

179 _____
Kathleen Alder, Chair

180

_____ Ty Cameron, City Recorder