

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, March 23rd, 2022, 6:00 pm

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

4  
5 To view the video recording account of the Planning Commission meeting please view our YouTube video of  
6 the meeting that can be found on Providence's YouTube channel: [Planning Commission 3/23/2022 - YouTube](#)  
7 (Ctrl + Click to follow link)

8  
9 **HR. MIN. SEC.** in **GREEN** above items are time stamps for YouTube Video of the Planning Commission meeting

10  
11 **Call to Order:** Brian Marble, Vice Chair

12 **Chair Roll Call of Commission Members:** Brian Marble

13 **Members in Attendance:** Robert Perry, Brian Marble, Rowen Cecil, Tyler Riggs & Joe Chambers.

14 **Excused:** Michael Fortune

15 **Staff Attendance:** Ryan Snow (City Manager), Skarlet Bankhead (Land Use Director) & Ty Cameron (City  
16 Recorder)

17 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Tyler Riggs

18  
19 **(1 MIN. 00 SEC.)**

20 **Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for March 9th, 2022.

21 **(MINUTES)**

- 22  
23
  - Brian Marble called for the approval of the minutes and asked if there were any corrections that  
24 needed to be made.
  - No corrections needed. Commission moved to approve the minutes.

25  
26  
27 **Motion to approve the minutes of March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022- Robert Perry. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Tyler Riggs**

28 **Vote:**

29 **Yea – Robert Perry, Tyler Riggs & Joe Chambers.**

30 **Ney-**

31 **Abstained-**

32 **Excused- Rowan Cecil (arrived later in the meeting), Michael Fortune.**

33  
34 **Motion Passes.**

35  
36 **Public Comments:** Citizens may express their views on issues within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction.

37 The Commission accepts comments: in-person, by email [providencacityutah@gmail.com](mailto:providencacityutah@gmail.com) , and  
38 by text 435-752-9441. By law, email comments are considered public record and will be shared  
39 with all parties involved, including the Planning Commission and the applicant.

- 40  
41
  - Brian Marble opened the floor for public comment.
  - No comments were made, no comments were received via email or text.
  - Brian Marble closed the public comment section of tonight's meeting.

44  
45 **Public Hearing(s):** No Public Hearings

46  
47 **Legislative – Action Item(s):** No Legislative Items

48  
49 **Administrative Action Item(s):**

50  
51 **(2 MIN. 55 SEC.)**

52 ➤ **Item # 1 Hillside Meadows Subdivision Final Plat:** The Planning Commission will  
53 consider and may take action on a request for approval of a final plat for Hillside Meadows Subdivision,  
54 a proposed 2-lot residential subdivision located in the general area of 59 S 300 E **(FINAL PLAT**  
55 **ANALYSIS)**

- 56
- 57 • Brian Marble called item number 1, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give
- 58 an overview of the final plat.
- 59 • Skarlet Bankhead discussed with the Commission the final plat analysis reviewing the findings
- 60 of fact, conclusions of law and the conditions. Skarlet Bankhead discussed with the Commission
- 61 the utility easement and the possible need for it to be 20 feet instead of 10 feet to allow access for
- 62 any future projects or repairs. Indicated that the applicants would need to provide water
- 63 availability assessment and include a statement stating building permits will not be issued until
- 64 conditions are met.
- 65 • Parties discussed the easement length and needed improvements.
- 66 • Parties discussed the frontage of the lots and asked the applicants if they could answer a few
- 67 questions.
- 68 • Cody and Myra Bland, applicants, discussed with the Commission their plans for the lots and
- 69 understood that there were certain conditions that they needed to work on. Parties discussed the
- 70 flag lot structure and its requirements.
- 71 • Parties discussed the fire marshals concerns and the possible need for a turnaround for lot 2.
- 72 Parties discussed obstruction requirement for allowing access and possibly putting in a note for
- 73 future development.
- 74 • Parties discussed the turnaround request and the setbacks.
- 75

76 **Motion to approve the final plat with its accompanying findings of facts, conclusions of law and**  
77 **conditions; as well as the condition that applicants place a note on the plat indicating approval of a 20-**  
78 **foot utility easement and a note that the driveway be unobstructed for emergency access – Joe Chambers.**  
79 **2<sup>nd</sup> Rowan Cecil.**

80 **Vote:**

81 **Yea – Robert Perry, Tyler Riggs, Rowan Cecil & Joe Chambers.**

82 **Ney-**

83 **Abstained-**

84 **Excused- Michael Fortune.**

86 **Motion Passes.**

87  
88 **Study Items(s):**

89  
90 **(34 MIN. 50 SEC.)**

91 ➤ **Retaining Wall Code Amendment:** The Planning Commission will review, and discuss a request from  
92 Brett & Idena Ward, 879 Grandview Dr, to amend PCC 10-8-3 No. 8 Retaining walls **(CODE**  
93 **AMENDMENT REVIEW)**

- 94
- 95 • Brian Marble called the study item for tonight’s meeting, gave a brief introduction, and asked if
- 96 Commission had any comments or questions. Commission indicated that they first wanted to
- 97 hear from the applicants and staff.
- 98 • Mr. & Ms. Ward, applicants, took the stand and gave the Commission an overview of their
- 99 request, why they are making a code amendment request regarding retaining walls and the
- 100 situation they are currently in due to their retaining wall being in violation of the city code.
- 101 • Ryan Snow elaborates on the history of the Ward’s retaining wall and the current violation of it
- 102 regarding the city code and its setbacks.
- 103 • Parties discussed current code and the proposed change to it. Commission asked how their
- 104 neighbors felt about their wall.
- 105 • Parties discussed how this violation occurred and if it could have been avoided. The Wards
- 106 indicated that there was a lot of miscommunications.
- 107 • Parties discussed the proposed planter box in the original and proposed design.
- 108 • Parties discussed retaining wall codes of other cities and how they relate to Providence City’s
- 109 code. Parties discussed what is and isn’t allowed in setbacks and why the retaining wall
- 110 requirement is set at 6 feet. Parties discussed the retaining wall ordinance history.
- 111 • Parties discussed the retroactivity request that is in the application and whether that is a valid
- 112 request. Commission indicate that rarely do code amendments have retroactivity.
- 113 • Parties reviewed the variance process and requirements and the applicants current contract with
- 114 the city regarding the issue. Commission discussed with the applicants their plans if the code
- 115 amendment doesn’t get approved.
- 116 • Parties discussed the easement, setbacks, and property lines regarding the applicants home and
- 117 their neighbors.
- 118 • Parties discussed recommendations and possible solutions.
- 119

120 **Motion to continue this study item allowing staff to gather more information – Robert Perry. 2<sup>nd</sup> –**  
121 **Rowan Cecil.**

122 **Vote:**

123 **Yea – Robert Perry, Tyler Riggs & Joe Chambers.**

124 **Ney-**

125 **Abstained-**

126 **Excused- Rowan Cecil (arrived later in the meeting), Michael Fortune.**

128 **Motion Passes.**

129

130 **Motion to adjourn meeting – Rowan Cecil. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Tyler Riggs.**

131 **Vote:**

132 **Yea – Robert Perry, Tyler Riggs, Rowan Cecil & Joe Chambers.**

133 **Ney-**

134 **Abstained-**

135 **Excused- Michael Fortune.**

136

137 **Motion Passes.**

138

139 Meeting adjourned.

140

141

142 Minutes prepared by Ty Cameron, City Recorder

143 Minutes approved by the Planning Commission on the \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ 2022.

144

145

146

147

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Fortune, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ty Cameron, City Recorder

149