

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, April 12, 2023, 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 the Planning  
6 Commission webpage or click on the following YouTube link: [Planning Committee 4/12/2023 - YouTube\\*](#)

7 \*YouTube Video cuts out at the 2-hour 13 min mark.

8  
9 **Call to Order:** Michael Fortune

10 **Chair Roll Call of Commission Members:** Shelly Nazer, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Robert Henke, Bob  
11 Washburn & Joe Chambers

12 **Staff in Attendance:** Skarlet Bankhead (Community Development Director), Ty Cameron (City Recorder) &  
13 Ryan Snow (City Manager)

14 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Bob Washburn.

15  
16 **14 MIN. 10 SEC.**

17 **Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for March 22nd, 2023.

18 **(MINUTES)**

- 19  
20
- 21 • Michael Fortune called for the approval of the minutes of March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023.
  - 22 • Shelly Nazer indicated that a correction was needed on line 112 – ‘park stirps’ should be ‘park strips’.
  - 23 • Bob Washburn indicated that on line 58 ‘conclusions of all’ should be ‘conclusions of law’ and on line  
24 109 ‘this’ should be ‘there’.

25 **Motion to approve the minutes of March 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023, with the recommended corrections – Shelly Nazer.**  
26 **2<sup>nd</sup> – Bob Washburn.**

27 **Vote:**

28 **Yea- Shelly Nazer, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Bob Washburn & Joe Chambers.**

29 **Ney-**

30 **Abstained-**

31 **Absent- Tyler Riggs.**

32  
33 **Motion passes, minutes approved.**

34  
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 [providencacityutah@gmail.com](mailto:providencacityutah@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 comments announcing that comments for items on the  
41 agenda could be made when the item is called.
  - 42 • Staff confirmed that no general comments had come in via text or email.
  - 43 • No comments were made.
  - 44 • Michael Fortune closed the public comment section of the meeting.
- 45  
46

47  
48 **Public Hearings:**  
49

- 50 • Mr. Fortune advised those in attendance on the need for decorum and civility regarding comments  
51 during public hearings. Related disparaging comments that have been made in previous public  
52 hearings by citizens and asked those present who would be making comments to be respectful and  
53 civil.
- 54 • The Planning Commission relayed the public hearing process and their responsibility in making a  
55 recommendation to the City Council, who would have the final say regarding the issues or make the  
56 final decision.

57  
58 **24 MIN. 45 SEC.**

59 ➤ **Item No. 1 Providence 10 LLC Parcel 02-117-0022 Zone Request:** The Providence City  
60 Planning Commission will take comments and questions regarding a request to zone parcel 02-117-0022  
61 to R-M-12 & R-1-12. Parcel is currently being considered for annexation by the Providence City  
62 Council. The public hearing for the actual annexation of parcel 02-117-0022 will be before the City  
63 Council in May.

- 64  
65 • Michel Fortune called item 1, gave a brief introduction, and opened the floor for public comment  
66 indicating that they would begin by using the sign in/public comment list to call residents to the  
67 podium to make their comment.
- 68 • Mary Pace, resident, expressed her concern regarding multi-family housing citing narrow roads  
69 and increased traffic that come about with multi-family housing. Suggested that the parcel be  
70 only single-family homes. Parties discussed the developers concept map\* and the County map  
71 regarding the parcel and the surrounding area.
- 72 • Alan Miller, resident, commented on preserving the amazing neighborhood, that he is a part of,  
73 for his family and for future families. Stated that the developers' proposal doesn't fit the design  
74 of the city and we need to protect the children in this area. Advised that we should not allow  
75 development to get out of control. Parties discussed the R-1-12 zone. Mr. Miller commented on  
76 the traffic issues this development could bring. Suggested that the parcel be zoned to single-  
77 family only in order to preserve what makes Providence special.
- 78 • Michael Fortune reported that the Planning Commission has read and reviewed the comments  
79 that came in via email regarding this item. Mr. Fortune clarified the County map that shows the  
80 zone designations in the area and the developers map and its streets or road access and locations\*
- 81 • Megan Miller, resident, indicated that she was against high density housing and commented on  
82 the turnover the comes with high density housing. Expressed concern with the number of  
83 children in the area and how increased traffic will affect their safety. Relayed bus routes and  
84 strain the school district is under with the increase in students that they have had recently with  
85 the other high density housing developments in the area. She does not recommend that the area  
86 be zoned for multi-family housing.
- 87 • Julia Lyman, resident, informed on the benefits of single-family housing and the recent increase  
88 in the city of multi-family housing developments. Stated that the area is not ready for multi-  
89 family housing.
- 90 • Michelle Kitchens, resident, asked about the developers responsibility for infrastructure for the  
91 area and who covers the cost. The Planning Commission discussed with those present the  
92 purpose of impact fees and infrastructure process. Ms. Kitchens commented on the lack of

93 balance in Providence regarding housing and that the city is already maxed out with high density  
94 housing. Reported that she was told that the area would remain single-family housing when they  
95 moved into the area. Is against multi-family housing.

- 96 • Michael Fortune shared information on State legislation regarding the housing market in the State  
97 and the city being required to meet certain requirements and how the city will meet those  
98 affordable housing requirements.
- 99 • Daniel Kitchens, resident, motioned to the Planning Commission to zone the area as R-1-12  
100 only.
- 101 • Robert Clark, resident, stated he is against multi-family housing and suggested the area be  
102 single-family only. Commented on the land to the west and that land remaining agricultural.  
103 Discussed his experience of being on the city of Mendon's Planning Board and understands the  
104 need for change but is against multi-family housing for this parcel.
- 105 • Max Johnson, resident, noted that he would like the parcel to stay single-family and shares  
106 concern with others regarding increased traffic and property value loss that comes with multi-  
107 family housing.
- 108 • Holly Lewis, resident, addressed censorship and the citizens being able to say what they want to  
109 say. Expressed concern over allowing multi-family housing in the area and that it would bring  
110 increased traffic, which would be a safety concern for the children in the area and that it would  
111 also decrease the value of their homes. Suggested that multi-family housing is inconsistent with  
112 the zones surrounding this parcel and recommended that this parcel only be R-1-12. Understood  
113 the States authority and power regarding housing development law in recent legislation but still  
114 doesn't think multi-family housing works in this area. Commented on increased crime rate that  
115 surrounds multi-family housing developments.
- 116 • The Planning Commission clarified their responsibilities and the process of ordinances, and city  
117 law and importance of voicing these concerns to our State representatives.
- 118 • Heather Blotter, resident, commented on the road development in the area or lack of it.  
119 Understands the need for affordable housing but that it should be placed in an area that is more  
120 fitting and this area is not it. Reported on the high turnover rate in schools that have high density  
121 housing and the difficulties that come with it. Supports single-family housing only for this  
122 parcel.
- 123 • Chalyce Carlsen, resident, thanked the Planning Commission for all that they do and know it's  
124 not easy to make these decisions. Commented on the parcel being close to the USU research  
125 farm, understands the need for affordable housing but believes with this farm and its history that  
126 multi-family housing would not work in this area. Expressed concern over traffic increase and  
127 overall density. Because of the uniqueness of this area, it should remain single-family housing.  
128 Detailed the recent city newsletter report that mentioned the city listening to its citizens and  
129 hopes that the Planning Commission will listen to what is being said here tonight.
- 130 • Dan Meszaros, resident, relayed the history of the neighborhood and community. Stands with the  
131 majority of those who have expressed that the parcel only be zoned single-family. Commented  
132 on housing growth and the difference that can be seen regarding need and purpose between  
133 Cache Valley and the Salt Lake Valley. Cited reports on medium income, crime rate increase  
134 that is not included in the data or records and is super pro single-family housing for this parcel.
- 135 • Alan Miller, resident, highlighted the annexation proposal that was before the City Council last  
136 month and the importance of the recommendation the Planning Commission makes to them  
137 regarding the zoning.

- 138 • Jeff Horsburgh, resident, thanked the Planning Commission for their service. Indicated that he  
139 supports the annexation but does not support it being zoned with multi-family zoning. Discussed  
140 what has been presented on the developers application and what has been discussed here tonight  
141 and all the unknowns that go along with approving this zone as multi-family. Asked about what  
142 studies have been done or will be done regarding the infrastructure of this area and traffic  
143 controls. The Planning Commission responded that the city has master plans that layout  
144 guidelines on how the city should develop or grow. These master plans are updated as the city  
145 grows. Master plans can be found here: [Master Plans – Providence City](#)
- 146 • Anne Van Leeuwen, resident, commented on the parcel in question and her homes proximity to  
147 it. Addressed affordable housing and the current housing market. Believes high density housing  
148 belongs near public transportation, and higher traffic roads and access points. Commented on the  
149 developers map and plans and made suggestions of incorporating a buffer like a park or  
150 playground. Parties discussed zoning and buffers between zones. Ms. Van Leeuwen stated the  
151 parcel should be single-family and if not should include a buffer at the very least.
- 152 • Pat Reading, resident, reiterated the concerns that residents have expressed here tonight and  
153 agreed that she worried about safety for the children, increased strain on the schools and doesn't  
154 think more density is needed. Is against multi-family zoning.
- 155 • Tom Reading, resident, commented on the access points in the neighborhood and suggested that  
156 they keep the area single-family housing.
- 157 • Nephi DeBruin, resident, talked on high density housing and the amount of additional traffic it  
158 brings and is against multi-family housing.
- 159 • Jason Holmes, resident, indicated that he is pro home ownership and pointed out highest and best  
160 use real estate practices. Understands that once the zone is approved it is hard to change so it's  
161 important that they get it right. Is for single-family housing.
- 162 • Steve Simmons, Cache County, commented on the possibility of future development in the area  
163 that has been discussed and indicated that the area around 2100 S\* was his land and had no  
164 intentions of developing anything, nor would the road be widened. Michael Fortune clarified his  
165 previous comment regarding that road and the 2100 S area\*.
- 166 • Parties discussed current and possible future access points and emergency vehicle access.
- 167 • Sage Peery, resident, cited increased crime rate with multi-family housing and gave examples of  
168 areas in the valley due to his experience on the force. Commented on the depreciation of those  
169 houses in those areas and is against multi-family housing.
- 170 • Kendall Pace, resident, commented on high density housing and the Planning Commissions  
171 process and urged the Planning Commission to follow the wishes of the residents. Recommends  
172 that the parcel be zoned R-1-12 only.
- 173 • Michael Fortune closed the public hearing.

## 175 **2 HR. 01 MIN 10 SEC.**

176 ➤ **Item No. 2 Flood Plain Management and Regulations Code Amendment:** The Providence  
177 City Planning Commission will take comments and questions regarding an amendment to the  
178 Providence City Code dealing with Floodplain Management and Regulations, PCC 10-16-2.

- 180 • Michael Fortune called item 2, gave a brief introduction, and opened the floor for public  
181 comment.
- 182 • Staff indicated no comments had come in via email or text regarding this item.
- 183 • No comments were made.

- Mr. Fortune closed the public hearing.

**Legislative – Action Item(s):**

**2 HR. 02 MIN 10 SEC.**

- **Item No. 3 Providence 10 LLC Zone Request:** The Providence City Planning Commission will review, discuss, and may make a recommendation to the City Council regarding a request from Providence 10 LLC to zone parcel 02-117-0022 to R-M-12 & R-1-12. ([ZONE ANALYSIS](#))
  - Michael Fortune called item 3, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an overview of the request.
  - Skarlet Bankhead indicated to the Planning Commission that they could rely on the area and general boundaries of the zones but that any plans that are presented cannot be relied upon as staff has not reviewed those plans and wont until the annexation has been approved. The plans and designs could change as the developer would have the right to do so.
  - Parties discussed the annexation application, annexation process and the subdivision process. Parties discussed the zone boundaries for this parcel and the zoning of the surrounding area.
  - Skarlet Bankhead advised of the importance of residents of making their voices and concerns heard at a state level. Ms. Bankhead reviewed the staff report of the zone request explaining what local and State codes were used and followed. Discussed the findings of fact which included the city’s master plans and the city’s new moderate income housing plan that was approved recently per the States requirement.
  - Parties discussed traffic studies and what is incorporated into those studies and when they are done. The parties detailed park plans and trails, current and future water needs of the city and sensitive areas.
  - Skarlet Bankhead reviewed the conclusions of the staff report discussing with the Planning Commission the city’s zoning districts, annexation process and the city’s general plan. Emphasized the city’s responsibility to try and follow through with their new moderate income housing plan and making steps towards meeting the goals that they have set forth.
  - Shelly Nazer commented on previous developments not being counted towards the new plan and reporting and the goals that they have set in that plan.
  - Bob Washburn responded on the statement of preserving a sense of place and how that correlates with the new moderate-income plan.
  - Parties discussed the new moderate-income plan and how to follow through with what they have set forth.
  - Shelly Nazer commented on the city’s general plan and the zoning maps that have been established.
  - Brian Marble asked if a sewer lift station would be needed for this area. Parties responded that they believed one would not be needed as it looked like it would all gravity feed.
  - Michael Jewell, developer, outlined what has been said tonight regarding the zone request and general housing developments in the area and state. Discussed road access for the area and the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organizations plans for the area. Commented on the traffic in the area and indicated that single family housing doesn’t always mean less traffic, nor does townhomes mean more traffic.

- 229
- 230
- 231
- 232
- 233
- 234
- 235
- 236
- 237
- 238
- 239
- Mr. Jewell relayed the infrastructure and development process and the comments made regarding school districts having to take on more students with multi-family housing developments. Discussed with the Planning Commission reports regarding middle housing studies that have been done and their need and benefit. Noted the current housing market and the increase in building costs over the recent years. Commented on the housing supply and demand that is happening all over the State and the current developments that are happening in the valley.
  - The parties discussed possible buffers between the zones and the history of the parcel and previous annexation. Parties discussed the parcels or land next to this parcel and possible developments in the future.
  - Mr. Jewell commented on the housing shortage and townhomes and what place making means to him.

240

241 **Motion to extend the meeting as it is past 9 pm – Brian Marble. 2<sup>nd</sup> Bob Washburn.**

242 **Vote:**

243 **Yea- Shelly Nazer, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Bob Washburn.**

244 **Ney- Joe Chambers.**

245 **Abstained-**

246 **Absent- Tyler Riggs**

247

248 **Motion passes, parties resume discussion of item 3.**

249

- Shelly Nazer asked about Garden drive road and its width. Mr. Jewell responded that they would continue with the same width.
- Brian Marble asked about their zoning request and why they didn't just have it zoned agricultural. Mr. Jewell indicated that the zone was set up for mixed use but believed this zone for single family housing and multi-family housing would be more beneficial to the area.
- Robert Henke commented on starter homes and the changes that he has seen over the years in price and what is considered a starter home.
- Bob Washburn cited access problems for this development, safety issues for the children and access to the main roads as well as the USU research farm being right next to this parcel.
- Brian Marble commented on the safety issues that have been brought up and the turnover of families moving in and out of multi-family developments.
- The parties discussed traffic flow for the area, the possible number of cars and the increase in density that is seen with townhomes.
- Brian Marble commented on the zone recommendation and would suggest they recommend R-1-12 for the whole area.
- Parties discussed R-1-10 lots and other zones for the area.
- Joe Chambers commented that the R-1-10 was not presented to the public and believes they should do another public hearing if that is what they want to request.

268

269 **Motion to recommend to the City Council that Providence 10 LLC parcel 02-117-0022 be zoned as R-1-12 in its entirety – Joe Chambers. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Shelly Nazer.**

270 **Vote:**

271 **Yea- Shelly Nazer, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Bob Washburn & Joe Chambers.**

272 **Ney-**

273 **Abstained-**

274

275 **Absent- Tyler Riggs**  
276  
277  
278

279 ➤ **Item No. 4 Flood Plain Management and Regulations Code Amendment:** The Providence  
280 City Planning Commission will review, discuss, and may make a recommendation to City Council  
281 regarding the amendment to the Providence City Code dealing with Floodplain Management and  
282 Regulations, PCC 10-16-2. **(CODE AMENDMENT REVIEW)**  
283

- 284 • Michael Fortune called item 4, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an  
285 overview of the amendment.
- 286 • Skarlet Bankhead discussed with the Commission the need for the amendment and the changes  
287 that have been made per the new FEMA floodplain maps. Discussed the importance of this  
288 amendment and the timeframe of getting it approved by the City Council before May 9<sup>th</sup>.
- 289 • Parties discussed flood insurance and the new FEMA maps.  
290

291 **Motion to recommend to the City Council that they adopt this code amendment as it is presented in the**  
292 **code review – Joe Chambers. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Bob Washburn.**

293 **Vote:**

294 **Yea- Shelly Nazer, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Bob Washburn & Joe Chambers.**

295 **Ney-**

296 **Abstained-**

297 **Absent- Tyler Riggs.**  
298

299 **Motion passes, code amendment to be presented to City Council.**  
300  
301

302 **Study Items(s):**  
303  
304

305 ➤ **Item No. 5 Landscape Rebate Ordinance:** The Providence City Planning Commission will  
306 review, discuss, and may move forward with initiating the process of establishing a Landscape Rebate  
307 Ordinance per the States Division of Water Resources program requirements. **(LETTER)** &  
308 **(PCC 7-1-8 PARK STRIPS)** & **(STAFF REVIEW)**  
309

- 310 • Michael Fortune called item 5, gave a brief introduction, and asked if they should table this item.
- 311 • Skarlet Bankhead commented that she had been in contact with Mark Anderson who works in  
312 landscaping and discussed the possibility of alternate resources for residents to xeriscape their  
313 park strips.
- 314 • Parties discussed how this rebate, if approved, would be administered, and regulated. Parties  
315 discussed alternate resources for the city and residents on possible other programs they could  
316 participate in.
- 317 • Skarlet Bankhead asked if the Planning Commission would be interested in hearing from Mark  
318 Anderson or local conservation groups to see what else is available.

319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363

- Shelly Nazer stated that it would be a good idea to also reach out to USU who conduct studies and have other resources for being water wise.
- Parties discussed alternate methods or resources and conservancy issues.
- Ryan Snow, via zoom, commented on the issue and posed the question that if the water districts and conservancy groups don't want to administer it than why should the city.
- Shelly Nazer asked if this item should be sent to the City Council to make a final decision.
- Parties discussed their options.

**Motion that the Planning Commission will take no further action on this item unless the city council requests it – Brian Marble. 2<sup>nd</sup> – Bob Washburn.**

**Vote:**

**Yea- Shelly Nazer, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Bob Washburn & Joe Chambers.**

**Ney-**

**Abstained-**

**Absent- Tyler Riggs.**

**Motion passes.**

**Motion to adjourn – Brian Marble. 2<sup>nd</sup>- Bob Washburn.**

**Vote:**

**Yea- Shelly Nazer, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Bob Washburn.**

**Ney-**

**Abstained-**

**Absent- Tyler Riggs & Joe Chambers.**

**Motion passes, meeting adjourned.**

**Minutes approved by the Planning Commission on \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2023.**

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

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



364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372

**NOTE FOR CLARIFICATION:** \* This is in reference to the most southern road in the development that can be seen in the map provided by the developer. Any reference made to "2100 South", "750 S" (Millville), and "700 S" are not to be construed to mean the existing pavement, access point, or anything else that can be considered an existing road way. Mr. Fortune's comments are referencing the most southern road in the concept map provided by the developer when he referenced "2100 S" 750 N (Millville), and "700 S".



373  
374  
375

376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423

**1)**

In regards to changing parcel 02-117-0022 to allow multi-family, multi-dwelling homes; I vote against this action. I vote to keep the parcel R-1-12 (single family homes). This will match the surrounding area, preserve why we bought our home, and to protect our home investment in Providence.

Cache Valley is largely undeveloped. There is no reason that Providence needs to overpopulate this one area, cramming people and families into tiny parcels.

Concerned,  
Daniel Kitchens

**2)**

We are opposed to all development in this lot... for a number of reasons as follows:

- Number one Reason .. Water Shortage .. development of any parcel is only as good as the longevity of what is constructed .. and any short term oversights often leads to long term lawsuits & greater community unrest ... not many things can have this devastating of long term disruptions than shortage on natural resources.. in particular water ..

With this very important matter in view ..

The navigating of community progression and population growth.. is something to be considered and addressed .. and with that consideration if development needed ..

A compromise of single unit housing is the only middle ground .. which keeps developers and community both in mind and working together ...

This specific project effects myself, my family of 7 and my community friends and family.

I would like to add the any running total of concern citizens that the house hold of 483 Garden Drive, providence Utah 84332 and the schroader family of 7, residing in a single family dwelling .. would like to add our voice, count our number and respectfully request the denial of any building on the afore mentioned (Parcel number 02-117-0022) sites.

Or at minimum and with equal portion of respect offered to each view point.. and settle on a compromising limit of such building to single family dwellings, preserving adequate water, safe driving , managing-able class sizes, minimal crime increases, and retention of community dignity, a lasting legacy that will not in ever so real and important future be regretted and short sighted ..

Sincerely yours  
A concerned family and citizens..  
Martin J Schroader ...

Thank you for your time, dedicated deliberation and balanced understanding.

**3)**

Greetings,

This email is to the Providence City P&Z Commission regarding the annexation and rezone of the above 10 acre parcel. My family and I live 1 block from this lot. My plea is for you to strongly consider

424 R-1-12 for the entire parcel. The entire subdivision is zoned R-1-12. I can't see any benefit to the  
425 neighborhood or the City overall for this parcel to be zoned for any high density zoning.  
426

427 I voiced my concerns/opinion in 2021 to the City Council. I learned the City was planning to zone the  
428 land as multiuse. I inquired what was the reasoning, since it wasn't in the core of town or near other  
429 higher density developments. I was told from Councilwoman Eck that the City wanted a buffer  
430 between the residential neighborhoods and Millville. Apparently Millville had zoned their side of the  
431 boundary line as commercial; however, this parcel doesn't even border Millville. According to the  
432 County Parcel Viewer, the 3 parcels immediately south (02-117-0023, 0038 & 0033) are all in the  
433 County, so they really shouldn't have a zoning designation determined yet. I can see why the City  
434 considered a buffer as a potential benefit to the surrounding neighborhoods, but I still maintain that  
435 this land should only be for detached homes. I don't know of anyone in my subdivision that would like  
436 this buffer. I work in real estate as my profession. I support smart growth and viable developments. I  
437 don't see what benefits the City or our subdivision would gain from this rezone.  
438

439 Throughout the county and state growth and development is becoming increasingly more difficult for  
440 everyone involved. Developers argue we don't have enough housing, which is true, while surrounding  
441 neighborhoods argue they don't want higher density in their neighborhoods because of adverse  
442 effects (decrease desirability to the surrounding area, more traffic, lack of parking, inconsistent with  
443 the area). I hope you hear the voices of the subdivision and only allow this parcel to be zoned R-1-12.  
444

445 Thank you for your time and consideration.

446  
447 - Jason  
448  
449

450 **4)**

451 Hello,  
452

453 I wanted to voice my opinion on opposing the multi-family apartments and condos on parcel 02-117-0022.  
454 Within the last two years I moved from south Logan that had the same scenario come up. I lived on a dead-end  
455 street that was perfect for my family and the neighborhood kids to enjoy that was then developed beyond that  
456 into over 200 smaller residences. It turned our low traffic street into the main entryway to this new  
457 neighborhood. Which then dramatically increased traffic and made us want to move here to a calm  
458 neighborhood in Providence.  
459

460 Building more families into a location means more traffic and more danger for our families. When I was 4 years  
461 old out playing on our bikes my older brother was hit and killed by a car in our neighborhood and I would do  
462 anything to lesson the risk of putting our kids and parents through something like that again if possible.  
463

464 Lastly, my oldest son Jeter is completely deaf in both ears and if he were to go out to play into high traffic  
465 streets without his cochlear implants on it only takes a split second and a small mistake of him not being able  
466 to hear a car coming, for him to be ran over as well.  
467

468 So I would highly recommend against this multi family proposal and the effects of it increasing our  
469 neighborhood traffic. Thank you!  
470

471 Thank you! – George  
472

473 **5)**

474 Dear Providence City Planning Commission,

475 This letter is in regards to the annexation and zone request R-M-12 and R-1-12 of parcel 02-  
476 117-0022 located in the general area of 480 W 600 S, Providence. We are Providence citizens  
477 living in the area that will be directly impacted by the annexation and zoning decision. Here are  
478 areas of concern that we would like to voice:

479 Safety:

480 There are multiple dangerous intersections that need to be evaluated and solutions resolved  
481 before adding any additional construction traffic and future residents.

482 • 500 South and Garden Drive (Notorious for a rolling stop intersection. Local youth even  
483 started a “Stop! Don’t roll” campaign a few years ago to bring awareness to this  
484 problem).

485 • 500 South and 480 West as well as 500 South and Meadow Lane (3 roads intersect with  
486 only 1 road having a stop sign)

487 • 500 South and 200 West (narrow road, with a slope that makes it difficult to see when  
488 trying to turn either North or South onto 200 West.

489 • 300 South and Garden Drive (Depending on the time of the day it is very difficult to  
490 cross this busy intersection. Also, the construction parking for the Fox Hollows  
491 Townhomes often lines both sides of the 300 South and obstructs the view.)

492 This specific area is experiencing massive growth. We have not yet fully felt the effects from the  
493 Ballard Springs 55+ community (39 single-family high-density homes) and the Fox Hollows  
494 Townhomes (Phase 1: 33 units, Phase 2: 27 units, with a total of 60 units). There is not public  
495 transportation in this area to help relieve traffic.

496 The intersections of concern listed above need to be addressed now regardless of what zoning  
497 is assigned to the property.

498  
499 Irrigation:

500 The Blacksmith Fork Irrigation Company has a Lateral ditch located on the west side of the  
501 property. This ditch continues North to the Hoth property. It is also located on the west side of  
502 our property located on 480 West. If this ditch is to be abandoned, there must be formal  
503 communication provided to all property owners involved. If it isn’t to be abandoned we worry  
504 about the safety of young children moving into the neighborhood and not being aware of the  
505 danger.

506 We are also concerned about the potential for flooding. When our neighbor’s home was being  
507 built, the construction company was unaware of the ditch and filled it in partially. This caused  
508 flooding in our backyard and nearly reached our neighbor’s newly constructed home. Again,  
509 there must be clear communication on the future of the ditch for all impacted property owners.

510  
511 Continuity Between Neighborhoods:

512 Zoning adjacent to the proposed property is R-1-10 and R-1-12. 2100 South, Garden Drive, 480

513  
514 West, 330 West, and 380 West are all single-family residences. Please consider maintaining R-  
515 1-12 next to existing homes for neighborhood continuity. Also, please assign a zone with ample

516  
517 green space to aesthetically match the existing open space of the USU Evans Research Farm on  
518 the west of the property. Wildlife is often found in this area and uses this parcel to migrate  
519 between areas. If a dense zone is assigned to this area, deer and other wildlife will be forced to  
520 use the very busy SR-165 which could lead to serious accidents and damage.

521 We trust you will listen and act on our concerns as citizens of Providence.

522 Thank you,  
523 Ryan and Megan Jones

524  
525 6)  
526 Good Morning Planning and Zoning:

527  
528 Steve and I would like to register our opposition to allowing multi-family apartments and condos on the 10 acre piece of  
529 land directly west of us adjacent to the east boundary of the USU Farm.

530  
531 Reason # 1 -- The surrounding neighborhood is completely single family homes. Is there a zone that would allow single  
532 family homes and maybe the zero lot line homes like are over north of the junior high school but NOT the packed in multi-  
533 story with not a bit of grass like east of Macey's.

534  
535 Reason # 2 -- With only one road to access this property the traffic increase on Garden Drive would be unreasonable if  
536 multi-family homes and condos were allowed. That level of development needs to be closer to major roads without  
537 routing the traffic through a neighborhood.

538  
539 Reason # 3 -- There seem to be a sufficient number of the close together "people living cubes" in Providence. It would be  
540 nice to build some single family homes or duplexes so people would have a place to live when they want to move out of  
541 the packed in apartments with no grass.

542  
543 Thank you;  
544  
545 Steve and Karen Guymon

546  
547 7)  
548 Dear Planning Commission,

549  
550 This email is in regards to **Agenda Item No. 1 Providence 10 LLC Parcel 02-117-0022 Zone Request.**

551 I am for zoning this parcel R-1-12 if it is annexed into Providence. I am against zoning it R-M-12, in whole or in  
552 part. R-M-12 is not consistent with the neighborhood or the mission of the City to maintain a rural-like feel. R-  
553 M-12 (multi-family apartments/condos) will increased traffic flow causing unsafe conditions on our streets,  
554 damage our property values, impaired or block the wonderful views that only exist in Providence, increased  
555 crime (as seen in other nearby cities), overburden our emergency services, negatively impact our already  
556 overcrowded schools, heighten noise, and may allow the developer to take advantage of the zone (as was  
557 done recently) by building more than expected.

558 Please listen to the voice of the residents of Providence and properly zone this property, R-1-12 (single family  
559 residential, 12,000 s.f. lots) **not** R-M-12.

560 Thank you,  
561  
562 Kendall Pace

563  
564