

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, September 14th, 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 9/14/2022 - YouTube](#)

7
8 **HR. MIN. SEC.** in **GREEN** above items are time stamps for YouTube Video of the meeting.

9
10 **Call to Order:** Michael Fortune

11 **Chair Roll Call of Commission Members:** Michael Fortune, Tyler Riggs, Joe Chambers, Bob Washburn,
12 Shelly Nazer and Brian Marble.

13 **City Staff:** Ryan Snow (City Manager), Skarlet Bankhead (Community Development Director), Ty Cameron
14 (City Recorder)

15 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Michael Fortune

16
17 **(3 MIN 05 SEC.)**

18 **Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for June 22nd, 2022.
19 **(MINUTES)**

- 20
21
 - Michael Fortune called for the approval of the minutes.
 - Shelly Nazer commented that there was a correction needed on line 65, the word ‘over’ should be
22 overview. Bob Washburn also commented that there was a correction needed on line 82 with the word
23 ‘amened’ which should be changed to amended.

24
25
26 **Motion to approve the Planning Commission minutes of June 22nd with the stated corrections – Joe
27 Chambers. 2nd – Tyler Riggs.**

28 **Vote:**

29 **Yea – Michael Fortune, Tyler Riggs, Joe Chambers, Shelly Nazer and Brian Marble.**

30 **Ney-**

31 **Abstained-**

32 **Absent-**

33
34 **(4 MIN. 30 SEC.)**

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

- 39
40
 - Michael Fortune opened the floor for public comment. Confirmed with staff that no general comments
41 had come in via email or text. Staff did indicated that they received two comments but that both were for
42 the public hearing.
 - Michael Fortune closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

47
48 **Public Hearings:**

49
50 **(5 MIN. 25 SEC.)**

- 51 ➤ **Item No. 1 Zoning of Parcels 02-004-0001 & 02-004-0002 (Vineyard North Phase):** The
52 Providence City Planning Commission will take comments and questions regarding a request from
53 Visionary Homes to zone parcels 02-004-0001 & 02-004-0002 located in the general area of 600 S & S
54 1000 E and which are currently in the annexation process, to be zoned as Single-Family High (SFH).
55
- 56 • Michael Fortune called item 1, gave a brief introduction and asked staff to read the comments regarding
57 this item that came in via email.
 - 58 • Ty Cameron, City Recorder, read the comments on the record. (Comments are attached below).
 - 59 • Michael Fortune opened the floor for public comment.
 - 60 • Tyler Riggs, Commission Member, commented that he is a resident of the Vineyard and will recuse
61 himself from the vote.
 - 62 • Gary Wilkerson, River Heights Resident, commented on the meetings he has had with Visionary and the
63 surrounding neighborhood regarding this project, and that they have been productive meetings.
64 Commented on high density housing and advocated for Single Family Medium housing for the area.
65 Commented on the recent referendum.
 - 66 • William Nee, Resident of the Vineyards, commented on the proposed amenities for the area or project
67 and asked about their current status.
 - 68 • Natalie Pace, River Heights Resident, commented on the fencing for the project and possible issues.
69 Asked about the current trail and what the plans were for it.
 - 70 • Jim Brackner, River Heights Resident, and former Mayor, commented on the previous plans for the area
71 and recommended a medium density development for the area. Commented on the proximity of the
72 school to the development and possible safety issues.
 - 73 • Ruth Nielsen, River Heights Resident, commented on the increased traffic in the area, the proximity of
74 the school and recommended a medium density zoning for the area.
 - 75 • Alison Olsen commented on the Vineyard project, their proposed plan and recommended a medium
76 density zoning. She commented on the proposed amenities and asked about the roads in the area.
 - 77 • Jan Arnel, Providence City Resident, commented on the annexation and it possibly creating an island of
78 County owned land and if that would be an issue. Asked about road access on 600 S. and commented on
79 the referendum.
 - 80 • Ryan Snow, City Manager, commented that islands are allowed, and the County has reviewed the
81 annexation and have no issues with it.
 - 82 • Michael Fortune thanked everyone for commenting and closed the public hearing.

83
84 **Legislative – Action Item(s):**

85
86 **(28 MIN. 15 SEC.)**

- 87 ➤ **Item No. 2 Zoning Recommendation for Parcels 02-004-0001 & 02-004-0002 (Vineyard**
88 **North Phase):** The Providence City Planning Commission will review, discuss, and may take action on

89 making a recommendation to City Council regarding the zoning of parcels 02-004-0001 & 02-004-0002.

90 (REQUEST) & (EXHIBIT)

- 91
- 92 • Michael Fortune called item 2, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an
- 93 overview of the request.
- 94 • Joe Chambers, emphasized their duties and responsibilities as it relates to making a recommendation
- 95 regarding this request
- 96 • Skarlet Bankhead gave an overview of the annexation process and indicated that they are just making a
- 97 recommendation regarding the zone designation and nothing else. She commented on the general plan
- 98 for the area and the history of the LCR zone. Discussed with the Commission the maximum and
- 99 minimum lot units and net acreage. Indicated that there are not many differences between the Single-
- 100 Family High zone designation and the Single-Family Medium zone designation. She reviewed with the
- 101 Commission the difference between the zones which included side yard measurements and frontage.
- 102 Commented on twin housing developments and how they look regarding lot sizes and property lines.
- 103 She discussed the uses for SFH and SFM zones.
- 104 • Shelly Nazer asked about the zoning to the North of Vineyard in River Heights and the zoning South.
- 105 • Parties discussed the different zones in the area and reviewed the County parcel map showing the
- 106 different zones. Parties discussed the number of lots between the two zones and the net acreage.
- 107 • Dallas Nicoll, Visionary Representative, commented on the development and the history of the parcels.
- 108 He responded to questions that were asked during the public hearing. He indicated that Visionary is
- 109 committed to providing the amenities that were shown and promised from the start. Commented that the
- 110 roads would be public so they would be wider with better access. Stated they have learned from the
- 111 South phase development and are looking to improve the North phase significantly.
- 112 • Parties discussed street parking and current issues, right of way width and indicated that the developers
- 113 would be subject to the city ordinances that were in place regarding public roads.
- 114 • Dallas Nicoll indicated that Visionary was not fencing the perimeter and that if residents wanted to do so
- 115 they would have to do it with white vinyl so that it is consistent throughout. He commented on the
- 116 walking trail and that the previous one has been done away with.
- 117 • Parties discussed access points to the development and specifically access to 600 S.
- 118 • Dallas Nicole commented on the traffic in the area and indicated that now that Spring Creek Parkway is
- 119 a through street that they should see a little less traffic. Commented on the outreach they have done with
- 120 engaging the public and being as upfront as possible. Indicated that the plans they see here today were
- 121 the plans that were shown to the public during the city celebration.
- 122 • Parties discussed the amenities for the area and any development agreements that have been made or
- 123 proposed with the residents of the area.
- 124 • Shelly Nazer commented on access points and recreation space.
- 125 • Parties discussed single family housing, density, lot sizes and what the main differences are between
- 126 SFH and SFM.
- 127 • Brian Marble motioned to recommend to City Council that the parcels be zoned as Single-Family High.
- 128 • Joe Chambers asked if the motion could be amended to include some statement that the developers are
- 129 not to exceed 74 units.
- 130 • Parties discussed the zones and their recommendation responsibilities and what they can recommend.

- Brian Marble retracted his motion.

Motion to recommend to City Council that parcels 02-004-0001 & 02-004-0002 be zoned as Single-Family High subject to City Council taking action in the annexation approval to bind Visionary to a density of no more than 74 lots – Joe Chambers. 2nd - Brian Marble.

Vote:

Yea – Michael Fortune, Joe Chambers and Brian Marble.

Ney- Shelly Nazer

Abstained- Tyler Riggs

Absent-

- **Motion passes.** Planning Commission recommends to City Council that they zone parcels 02-004-001 & 02-004-0002 to Single Family High with the intention that City Council look into binding Visionary to no more than 74 lots.

Administrative Action Item(s):

(1 HR. 34 MIN 30 SEC.)

- **Item No. 3 Little Baldy Place Subdivision Partial Amended No.2:** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider and may take action on a request to approve the Little Baldy Place Subdivision Partial Amended No. 2, amending an internal lot restriction on Lot 30 by moving the buildable envelope to the east. **(STAFF REPORT)**
- Michael Fortune called item 3, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an overview of the request.
- Skarlet Bankhead discussed with the Commission the history of the Little Baldy Subdivision and their building envelopes. Commented on the staff report and the uniqueness of these lots. Reviewed with the Commission the requirements and lot restrictions. Indicated that the Commission would need to find good cause for this request to be approved.
- Parties discussed sensitive areas and changes that have been made. Parties discussed storm water and drainage for the area. Parties discussed increasing the building envelope and excavation elevations.
- Developers commented on their request and the water pressure for the area. Indicated that the homeowner was hoping to move the building envelope to avoid having the power lines over the house and that this change would also allow for a better and more manageable driveway.
- Parties discussed good cause to approve this request and retaining walls for the property.

Motion to approve the Little Baldy Place Subdivision Partial Amended No. 2 Lot 30 building envelope to the East subject to the staff reports findings of facts, conclusions of law, conditions; and with good cause showing that by doing so would allow home to be farther away from power lines, driveway to be safer and owner being allowed to maximize their property rights – Tyler Riggs. 2nd – Joe Chambers

Vote:

Yea – Michael Fortune, Tyler Riggs, Joe Chambers, Shelly Nazer and Brian Marble.

Ney-

174 **Abstained-**
175 **Absent-**

176
177 **Motion Passes.** Developers and homeowner will be permitted to move the building envelope per their request.

178
179 **Motion to adjourn meeting – Shelly Nazer. 2nd- Brian Marble.**

180 **Vote:**

181 **Yea – Michael Fortune, Tyler Riggs, Joe Chambers, Shelly Nazer and Brian Marble.**

182 **Ney-**

183 **Abstained-**

184 **Absent-**

185
186 **Motion passes meeting adjourned.**

187

188 **Emailed Comments Regarding Item 1**

189

190 **Comment 1**

191

192 This is for public comment for the Providence Planning Commission Meeting on Sep. 14, 2022.

193

194 Because the developer is not required to present a plan and follow that plan, choosing the correct zone to best
195 serve the current and future residents is crucial. I welcome the fact that the developer has said they'll build
196 wider roads, which is paramount for the safety and quality of life of the residents of Vineyard.

197

198 The plan shown at the city celebration seems to show 63 homes in this phase, which would make it a Single
199 Family Medium density for that acreage. Single Family High for that area would allow for 86 homes, even with
200 the wider roads. Again, since they are not required to follow what was shown at the city celebration or any plan
201 you may have seen, just the assigned zone, I feel like the only way to have the outcome of 63 (which looked
202 great and I support!) instead of 86 homes is to require Single Family Medium. If you grant them SFH, the final
203 result will be much more dense than the advertised rendering showed, and more dense than Brookside, as
204 shown in the next paragraph.

205

206 Visionary is asking for a Single Family High zone, which is the same zone as Brookside Village. I went to the
207 county parcel map and wrote down the sizes of the lots in that development. Of the 145 lots I saw, 26 of them
208 are the minimum size, .14 acres, or 7.26 homes per acre. There are an additional 67 that are .15 through .18 of
209 an acre, which are also SFH. There are 13 homes that would fit into the Single Family Medium density (.19-
210 .22), 13 that would fit in the Single Family Residential density (.23-.26), and 26 that have the acreage for Single
211 Family Traditional or Single Family Large. It's clear that most of the Brookside development fits within the SFH
212 zone, but that is mitigated by the over 1/3 of the lots that are larger than SFH.

213

214 I will remind the commission that over 80% of voters and over 80% of survey respondents did not want this
215 area to have high density. I believe that includes Single Family High density.

216

217 Thank you for your consideration.

218

219 Barbara Moon

220

Comment 2

This is for the Providence Planning Commission meeting today regarding the annexation and zoning of Vineyard phase 2.

The latest plan shown at the city celebration for this parcel was consistent with Single Family Medium density. Given the current density on Phase 1, this seems a much more appropriate zoning density than Single Family High. I recommend that the planning commission zone this area as Single Family Medium. This will likely align more with the will of 80% of Providence voters than a Single Family High density will.

Thank you,

Kevin Moon

Exhibit Shown to PC during Item 3

