

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Meeting**
2 **164 N. Gateway Drive, Providence, UT 84332**
3 **April 12, 2017 6:00 p.m.**
4
5

6 **Attendance**

7 Chair: R James, Chairman
8 Commissioners: Rowan Cecil, Brent Fresz, Mike Harbin, John Parker
9 Excused: None
10 Absent: None
11
12

13 **Approval of the Minutes:**

14 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of March 22, 2017.
15

16 **Motion made to approve the minutes of March 22, 2017.-by B Fresz, seconded M Harbin.**
17

18 **Vote: Yea: R James, R Cecil, B Fresz, M Harbin, J Parker**
19 **Nay: None**
20 **Abstained: None**
21 **Excused: None**
22

23 Revisions - none
24

25 **Public Comments:** Citizens may appear before the Planning Commission to express their views on issues within
26 the City's jurisdiction. Comments will be addressed to the Commission. Remarks are limited to 3 minutes per
27 person. The total time allotted to public comment is 15 minutes.
28

29 **Comments**

- 30 • Todd Hendricks commented that a portion in the write up is cutoff for both the cul-de-sac and residential
31 streets.
- 32 • No other comments
33

34 **Action Item(s):**

35 **Item No. 1. Final Plat:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for approval a final plat for the
36 Providence Hollows Second Amendment Plat; dividing Lot 1 into two lots, located at 529 North 470 East,
37 Providence UT. (Discussion time approximately 10 minutes)
38

39 **Motion made to approve the final plat for the Providence Hollows Second Amendment Plat dividing Lot 1 into**
40 **two lots.-by R Cecil, seconded J Parker.**
41

42 **Vote: Yea: R James, R Cecil, B Fresz, M Harbin, J Parker**
43 **Nay: None**
44 **Abstained: None**
45 **Excused: None**
46

47 **Comments**

- 48 • S Bankhead identified a revision. This is a *final* plat approval, not a *preliminary* plat approval. Revision
49 made to Action Item No. 1, Final Plat.
- 50 • R Cecil comments were, that based on previous discussions and review he supports the approval of the
51 final plat.
- 52 • No other comments
53

1 **Item No.2. Proposed Code Amendment:** The Providence Planning Commission will consider for recommendation
2 to the City Council amending Providence City Code Title 11 Subdivision Regulations, Chapter 1 General Provision by
3 changing the definition of Minor Street (Residential & Minor); and Chapter 4 Design Standards, by amending the
4 arrangement of streets, clarifying the costs of new roads and repairs to existing roads caused by development,
5 clarifying the grades for intersections with pedestrian crossings, grades through cul-de-sacs, adding “swales”, and
6 amending non-connecting streets/turnarounds. (Discussion time approximately 15 minutes)
7

8 **Motion made to recommend the Design Standards Chapter 4 and the General Provision Chapter 1 to the City**
9 **Council with the one to 29 feet-by B. Fresz, seconded M Harbin.**

10 **Vote: Yea: R James, R Cecil, B Fresz, M Harbin, J Parker**
11 **Nay: None**
12 **Abstained: None**
13 **Excused: None**
14

15 Discussion

- 16 • R James commented on the extensive review completed on this code amendment to date. He asked Brent
17 Fresz to ensure that the additional changes he requested were included in the current revision.
 - 18 • B Fresz confirmed that all changes suggested were included.
 - 19 • R Cecil comment on a minimum 28-foot asphalt width listed in Chapter 4, Design Standards pg. 2, line 32.
20 He felt a 28-foot asphalt width is really too narrow. The absolute minimum asphalt width he would feel
21 comfortable approving would be 29 feet because even a 29-foot asphalt width could have the potential to
22 pose problems.
 - 23 • B Fresz commented on surveys and studies completed that all recommend a 28-foot minimum road
24 width.
 - 25 • J Parker commented that he was in agreement with Sherriff Jensen’s views that a wider street is better.
 - 26 • M Harbin agreed with these comments and supports a minimum 29-foot street width.
 - 27 • B Fresz concluded that a minimum street width of 29 feet is in the middle of the range of widths
28 recommended and he would support a revision to a 29-foot minimum road width.
 - 29 • R James restated the additional revision required on the proposed code amendment. On page 2 of 7, line
30 32, in Design Standards, change the minimum street width from 28 feet to 29 feet.
 - 31 • Todd Hendricks, Providence, commented on the proposed revision and said he felt a 29-foot minimum
32 road width was reasonable and acceptable. He wanted to comment about a 66 verses a 60-foot right of
33 way. If the proposed asphalt width is going to be 29 feet with a 60-foot right of way instead of a 66 -foot
34 right of way, more property taxes would be collected because the extra three feet on each side of the
35 road belongs to the homeowner. A residential road like that still leaves plenty of room for a 7-foot park
36 strip and a 5 to 6-foot sidewalk. He recommends a 60 or 62-foot right of way because it seems a little
37 more reasonable. He also wanted to mention the information he has distributed that contain the statistics
38 of how wide a neighborhood street should be. Narrower residential street are safer as all the statistics
39 point out. People travel more slowly, more cautiously and there is plenty of accessibility for fire trucks. He
40 would like the Planning Commission to consider a change on that right of way as well.
 - 41 • J Parker asked what the reference sources were used to gather those statistics.
 - 42 • T Hendricks responded that the main reference source used was the *Swift and Associates Civil and Traffic*
43 *Engineers Study*. Sheriff Jensen’s perspective comes from gut instinct.
 - 44 • J Drew responded to the comment stating that Sheriff Jensen was not asked to provide any specifics on
45 street widths or provided with any specifics on road widths before the City Council Meeting. He also felt
46 that the emergency vehicle issue was a non-issue even if there were cars parked on both sides of the
47 streets.
 - 48 • B Fresz commented on the emergency vehicle issue also. Standards identify the minimum road width for
49 emergency vehicles on a rural road is actually 18 feet with parking on one side and 24 feet if parking is
50 allowed on both sides of the street. The assumption is made that people will pull over.
 - 51 • R James thanked everyone who worked on the proposed code amendment and asked if there were any
52 additional comments.
 - 53 • No further comments.
- 54

1 **Study Item(s):**

2 **Item No. 1. Discussion: Danny Macfarlane will discuss a proposed rezone from Single-Family Traditional (SFT) to**
3 **Mixed Use (MXD) for Parcel No. 02-093-0028, a 2.03 acre parcel located at 196 West 100 North.**

- 4
- 5 • R James stated that this is a study item only. A public hearing will need to be held at some point.
- 6 • Danny MacFarlane commented on the proposed rezone. He would like to build an office for his company
- 7 in this location. To make that happen and to meet the asking price of the property, it does not make sense
- 8 to leave the zoning on this parcel residential. This is why we are proposing townhomes, 24 units. We did
- 9 this purposely with commercial space on one corner of 200 West with the townhomes being primarily on
- 10 the northeast and south side, which would create a buffer. It is a very busy intersection so we are limiting
- 11 the number of access points to two for safety reasons. We realize a mixed-use zone requires a portion to
- 12 be retail, commercial and residential so we are proposing that the commercial be some type of small
- 13 retail business. He also completed a tax study to determine the impact that the rezone to mixed –use
- 14 would have on tax revenue. Copies were distributed to the Planning Commission and the conclusions
- 15 made by the study were discussed.
- 16 • R Cecil commented that a request to rezone the parcel to mixed-used was proposed about three years
- 17 ago and it caused quite a bit of conflict.
- 18 • J Drew commented that many people did expressed concern. There were questions about whether there
- 19 were any plans yet on what would be going in there and if it followed the guidelines of Envision Utah.
- 20 • D MacFarlane responded that the proposal does follow Envision Utah. With populations doubling every
- 21 two years, the days of having ½ lots is becoming more limited. Affordability is also becoming more of a
- 22 problem.
- 23 • M Harbin asked how many parking stalls were needed.
- 24 • D MacFarlane reviewed how many parking stalls would be required.
- 25 • S Bankhead commented that developing concept plans would provide parking carports to not take up
- 26 more asphalt.
- 27 • R Cecil stated that he would very interested in what our residents have to say and would like to have a
- 28 public hearing soon.
- 29 • B Fresz recommended adding a note to show it is a two-car parking garage.
- 30 • The Planning Commission and D. MacFarlane commenced in further discussion of the rezone and future
- 31 development plans on the parcel. Types of businesses allowed in a commercial zone verses a mixed-use
- 32 zone were compared.
- 33

34 **Reports:**

35 **Staff Reports:** Any items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as informational only.
36 Canyon creek booth is moving along.

37 **Updates**

- 38 • Our General Plan Consultants are reviewing information provided by our city engineer. Dates are being
- 39 coordinated on when to conduct these workshops. The focus is on infrastructure. The workshops will be
- 40 held as public meetings.
- 41 • The Providence City Open House will be scheduled in May. This may be an opportune time to hold the
- 42 public hearing and meet with the consultants.
- 43

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

46
47 Agenda posted by Skarlet Bankhead on April 11, 2017.

48
49 **Motion to close the Planning Commission Meeting of April 12, 2017 made by R Cecil, seconded by J Parker.**

50 **Vote:**

51 **Yea:** R Cecil, B Fresz, M Harbin, R James, J Parker

52 **Nay:** None

53 **Abstained:** None

54 **Excused:** None

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.
Minutes prepared by K Merrill.

Robert James, Chairman

Kristine Merrill, Office Specialist