

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, February 28th, 2024, 6:00 pm

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

5 To view the video recording of the meeting please visit our YouTube channel found [HERE.*](#)

6 *There was an issue with the YouTube audio for the first half of the meeting.

9 **Call to Order:** Michael Fortune

10 **Chair Roll Call of Commission Members:** Robert Henke, Brian Marble (Had to leave mtg at 7:20 pm),
11 Michale Fortune, Bob Washburn & Shelly Nazer (Via Phone)

12 **Members Absent:** Joe Chambers

13 **Staff in Attendance:** Skarlet Bankhead, Ty Cameron & Colton Love

14 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Michale Fortune

17 **Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for January 24th, 2024.

18 **(MINUTES)**

- 20 • Michael Fortune called for the approval of the minutes.
- 21 • Bob Washburn commented that on line 96 the word ‘safely’ should be included in the sentence. Also
22 suggested that on lines 111-112 the words ‘building envelope’ also be included in the description as well
23 as the words ‘safe and reasonable’. Commented that on line 207 it was him and not Brian Marble who
24 commented on the large sign on Spring Creek Pkwy.
- 25 • Staff stated that they would make those requested changes.

27 **Motion to approve the minutes of January 24th, 2024, with the stated corrections. – Bob Washburn. 2nd –**
28 **Brian Marble.**

29 **Vote:**

30 **Yea- Robert Henke, Brian Marble, Michale Fortune, Bob Washburn & Shelly Nazer (Via Phone)**

31 **Nay-**

32 **Abstained-**

33 **Absent- Joe Chambers**

35 **Motion passes, minutes approved.**

37 **Public Comments:** Citizens may express their views on issues within the Planning Commission’s jurisdiction.

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

- 42 • Michael Fortune opened the floor for public comment.

- Staff indicated that a comment had come in via email but that it was for item 1 and that they would read it on the record when the item is called.
- No comments were made. Michael Fortune closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Public Hearings/Presentations:

- **Item No. 1 PCC Amendments Clear View Areas and Residential Driveways:** The Providence City Planning Commission will take comments and questions from the public regarding proposed changes to city code 10-9 that deals with clear view areas and residential driveways.
 - Michael Fortune called item 1, gave a brief introduction, and opened the floor for public comment.
 - Ty Cameron, City Recorder, read a comment on the record that was emailed in by Kevin Moon. (Comment attached to minutes below)
 - No further comments were made. Michael Fortune closed the public hearing for item 1.
- **Item No. 2 PCC 11-4-8 Fiber System Code:** The Providence City Planning Commission will take comments and questions from the public in regard to establishing new code for the city's Fiber Optic Network as it relates to land use.
 - Michael Fortune called item 2, gave a brief introduction, and opened the floor for public comment.
 - No comments were made. Michael Fortune closed the public hearing for item 1.
- **Item No. 3 PCC Amendments Retaining Walls Use and Construction:** The Providence City Planning Commission will take comments and questions from the public regarding proposed changes to the city code that regulates the use and construction of retaining walls.
 - Michael Fortune called item 3, gave a brief introduction, and opened the floor for public comment.
 - Larry Radabaugh, resident and owner of an agricultural property in town has been cleaning up the construction mess since the start of the development that has been occurring near his property. The elevation of the property along with the wind has caused a lot of trash to end up on his property. Suggested construction of retaining walls be based on a commonsense approach, which involves using the property line as a possible divider or allowing retaining walls on property lines. However he noted that three feet would not suffice for large animals, and at least four to five feet minimum would be necessary. Larry realizes that there will be issues with retaining walls on sloping hills with landscaping and packing issues.
 - Loretta Buckley, a resident, shares her experiences with Larry and his property. She purchased her property in a hilly area before it was even a lot, and they chose the area due to its great view. Loretta had three documents to share with the Planning Commission: a topo survey, a geotext study, and construction documents for Sage Crest. The topo survey revealed 32 feet from the lowest point of elevation to the grade to the sidewalk, with a section having a 57.1% grade. The international building code states that anything over 30% is extreme. She has also invested thousands of dollars in re-compaction of their lot to prepare for home construction. The color graphic, in her handout, provides a visual representation of all lots greater than 30% or higher.

89 While it is possible to put a retaining wall on these lots, it is important to be safe with the
90 pressure for the surrounding areas.

- 91 • Loretta acknowledged that many residents have either purchased a lot or are waiting for them to
92 be built on, as some properties are just lots with large piles of fill that are pushing out and
93 creating a big hill. As they continue to work on their property, they hope to provide more
94 information and resources to help others navigate the complex process of building on these types
95 of properties. Mentioned that terraced retaining walls are permitted where justified by
96 topographic conditions, but the combined height of all walls must not exceed 12 feet. This is a
97 concern for many homeowners, who have 32 feet of fall and want to landscape their property.
98 She proposes adding an additional item number in the document under D on location height,
99 separation, and plantings to address properties that have been raised. Agreed that terraced walls
100 should be engineered to handle weight, water, and other factors. Also suggested that terraced
101 walls can be raised, with the terrace doubled, and another wall added to give more height total.
102 Asking for more consideration in the code changes and the proposed changes to include other
103 options rather than landscaping.
- 104 • Larry Radabaugh commented on the engineering requirements and thought that it was a good
105 idea that would help with any future issues such as flooding.
- 106 • Michael Fortune thanked those who have commented, noted that there were no more comments
107 and closed the public hearing regarding this item.

108
109 ➤ **Item No. 4 PCC Amendments regarding Sign Regulations:** The Providence City Planning
110 Commission will take comments and questions from the public regarding proposed changes to the city
111 code regarding sign regulations.

- 112 • Michael Fortune called item 4, gave a brief introduction, and opened the floor for public
113 comment.
- 114 • No comments were made. Michael Fortune closed the public hearing regarding this item.

115
116
117 **Legislative – Action Item(s):**

118
119 ➤ **Item No. 5 PCC Amendments Clear View Areas and Residential Driveways:** The
120 Providence City Planning Commission will review, discuss, and may make a recommendation to the
121 City Council regarding proposed changes to city code 10-9 that deals with clear view areas and
122 residential driveways. [\(EXHIBIT\)](#)

- 123 • Michael Fortune called item 5, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give a
124 rundown of the amendments.
- 125 • Skarlet Bankhead commented that she has incorporated the most recent changes discussed in the
126 previous meeting, including the use of new graphics created by Justin Blaylock. Staff believe
127 these graphics capture the desired outcome. Skarlet addressed Bob Washburn's questions about a
128 part of the code regarding driveways that is not suggested for changes to 10-9-4. That part is
129 enforced through the stormwater code in Title 7 or the nuisance ordinance in Title 4. It states that
130 if a home is built on a parcel of property that is not in a developed subdivision, such as those in
131 downtown Providence with no curb, gutter, park strip, or sidewalk, it is considered a parcel of
132 property. This allows the city to prorate and have certain infrastructure installed if it makes sense
133 for the area. The stormwater part was crucial because it allowed people to consider stormwater
134

135 detention if their lot would cause additional runoff into the street. Clarified that the driveway
136 changes have been successful in incorporating improvements into homes. Some people may be
137 concerned about adding more construction costs, but most people are glad that the changes were
138 incorporated, as they don't want to drive through the gravelly part or have issue with stormwater
139 flooding.

- 140 • Noted that the focus of these amendments is on ensuring that people, regardless of their location,
141 pay attention to their driveways and avoid down sloping them into their houses. Many people
142 may choose to level or grade the area away from the house before the garage to mitigate any
143 stormwater issues, which may not be suitable due to snow and melt. Having it in code is a better
144 option. The Planning Commission asked if there are any current projects that require landowners
145 or citizens to make changes to their existing lots. Skarlet clarified that there are no current
146 projects that require changes to existing lots. The developers are currently in a lull on the
147 development side, but they will be looking at final plats for highlands and copper heights. As
148 they build infrastructure, they will start putting their infrastructure in and building them back up
149 in late summer. The developers have made people aware of proposed changes to the codes and
150 are now considering them when designing their houses.
- 151 • Parties discussed the safety issues of intersections and driveways in certain areas, such as on the
152 300 East and 100 East. Skarlet mentioned that there are numerous complaints about these
153 intersections, particularly at the 300 East. The city does have a tree maintenance budget to
154 address these issues but are more concerned about high traffic areas. Parties discussed certain
155 issue areas that cars have trouble pulling out into traffic such as the road by Zions Bank that has
156 some obstructions. The goal of this amendment is to reduce accidents and ensure the safety of all
157 residents.
- 158 • Parties discussed the issue of park strips, Kevin Moon's comment and suggestions regarding
159 large park strips which can be problematic if large trees are planted in the park strip regardless of
160 park strip size. The most common problem is the tree canopies blocking the drivers view of
161 traffic signs, pedestrians on sidewalks and oncoming traffic at intersections. Some small trees are
162 not tall enough to reach the eight feet trim requirement, making it difficult to view as well. Ty
163 Cameron, City Recorder, reread Mr. Moons comment.
- 164 • Parties try to understand and clarify what the comment is saying about property lines going 25
165 feet up the property, as some language would make the triangle bigger and closer to the house.
166 They believe that the property line should be taken into account when determining the size of the
167 park strip, as it could affect the visibility for pedestrians and drivers.
- 168 • Robert Henke commented that the width of the park strip doesn't matter as much as how close it
169 is to the street. Mentioned a situation they discussed last time where an undeveloped property
170 line goes into the public right away or public street.
- 171 • Skarlet commented that the city acknowledges that sometimes a public right of way overlaps
172 private property, and the clear view will be measured from the right of way line rather than the
173 property line.
- 174 • Parties discussed placement of stop signs in park strips and requirements and if they have any
175 bearing on these amendments. The Planning Commission emphasized the importance of
176 considering the location and visibility of the park strip in relation to the street and the
177 surrounding property lines and the potential impact of the current code on situations like the 300
178 E intersection.
- 179 • Parties continued discussion of the issue of trees blocking public view and the need for a clear
180 intersection site. Skarlet commented that to address these issues, the lines were extended to
181 create a triangle on the property and a rectangle type structure. Brian Marble acknowledges that
182 the stop sign is not part of the amendment and must go where it has to go. However, the code
183 states that nothing can block a stop sign.

- 184
- 185
- 186
- 187
- 188
- 189
- 190
- 191
- 192
- 193
- 194
- 195
- 196
- 197
- 198
- Parties discussed areas where there have been some near misses with pedestrians and making sure they approve these amendments, as their top priority should be safety. The goal is to ensure people can come to the intersection and see up the street while also being able to see what's happening on the sidewalk. This is important because sidewalk people sometimes get ignored.
 - Parties discussed the tree removal process and who is responsible for what. Parties talked about the importance of open space before a tree can be placed on a parking strip in clear view areas. Parties wonder if engineering exists that can determine the safe distance between a tree and other obstacles, such as stop signs or curbs. Skarlet commented that there is no engineering available to determine the safe distance between trees and parking strips but mentioned that many communities have clear view areas larger than 30 feet.
 - Shelly Nazer commented that she believes they were overthinking the issues and that these amendments cover their intent in providing safety to the city's residents.
 - Parties discussed the feet requirement, graphs and the need to make sure public comments are addressed.
 - No further comments or discussion. Michael Fortune called for a motion.

200 **Motion to recommend to the City Council that they approve the amendments to City Code 10-9 in**
201 **accordance with the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions as laid out in the staff report. –**
202 **Bob Washburn. 2nd – Robert Henke.**

203 **Vote:**

204 **Yea- Robert Henke, Michale Fortune, Bob Washburn & Shelly Nazer (Via Phone)**

205 **Nay-**

206 **Abstained-**

207 **Absent- Joe Chambers & Brian Marble.**

208

209 **Motion passes.**

210

211 ➤ **Item No. 6 PCC 11-4-8 Fiber System Code:** The Providence City Planning Commission will
212 review, discuss, and may make a recommendation to the City Council regarding a new code for the
213 city's Fiber Optic Network as it relates to land use. **(EXHIBIT)**

- 214
- Michael Fortune called item 6, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give a rundown of the amendments.
 - Skarlet Bankhead commented on the repetitiveness of the code but that it was needed. Discussed private versus public developments and that conduit installed by the developer on behalf of the city will be owned by the city. This is a requirement for both public and private systems. Gave examples of ownership regarding developments that are private versus those that are public. Noted that this is just a piece of the overall fiber code and that they are reviewing it because it deals with land use.
 - Parties discussed city versus private ownership as it relates to utility lines. Mrs. Bankhead commented that this code makes it clear that the fiber lines is owned and will be maintained by the city.

226 **Motion to recommend to City Council that they approve PCC 11-4-8 Fiber System in accordance with**
227 **the findings of facts, conclusions of law and conditions as stated in the staff report, and with the**
228 **addition that lines 20 & 36 include the word 'development'. – Bob Washburn. 2nd – Robert Henke.**

229 **Vote:**

230 **Yea- Robert Henke, Michale Fortune, Bob Washburn & Shelly Nazer (Via Phone)**

231 **Nay-**

232 **Abstained-**

233 **Absent- Joe Chambers & Brian Marble.**

234
235 **Motion passes.**
236

237 ➤ **Item No. 7 PCC Amendments Retaining Walls Use and Construction:** The Providence City
238 Planning Commission will review, discuss, and may make a recommendation to the City Council
239 regarding proposed changes to the city code that regulates the use and construction of retaining walls.

240 **(EXHIBIT)**

- 241
- 242 • Michael Fortune called item 7, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an
243 overview of the amendments. Michale Fortune asked if item 7 referenced item number 9 on the
244 agenda and if it would be best to call item 8 and then call item 7 and 9 together.
- 245 • Skarlet Bankhead responded that they do go together in a sense. Noted that item 7 was discussed
246 at the last meeting and is just the diagram that they are reviewing. Item 9 comes from that City
247 Council where they have asked the Planning Commission to review and make recommendations.
248 Mentioned that item 7 was on for a public hearing tonight and that item 9 is just a study item and
249 that the public hearing will be had by the City Council.
- 250 • Parties agree to move on to item 8 and then call item 7 & 9 together as they both deal with
251 retaining wall code.
- 252
- 253 • Michale Fortune called item 7 and item 9, gave a brief introduction, indicated that they are
254 seeking to make a recommendation on item 7 and that item 9 is a study item for them to review
255 and make comments and then send back to City Council where they'll have a public hearing and
256 move forward with approving those amendments.
- 257 • Parties discussed the updated diagram in item 7's staff report. Michael Fortune asked about walls
258 being built on property lines so long as the neighbors agree and that it is recorded for future
259 owners.
- 260 • Parties discussed allowing fences on retaining walls. The parties talked about retaining walls that
261 are six feet or higher with a fence. Scarlett believes that putting a fence on top of a retaining wall
262 makes it part of the fence, but the fence ordinance allows for higher heights based on topography
263 for safety and privacy issues. However, if a fence is directly on top of a retaining wall, the height
264 is read as a combined height which may make the fence taller than it should be. The overall
265 fence ordinance also discusses extending the height of a fence due to topography. If the fence is
266 not attached to the retaining wall but is right next to it, it is acceptable. However, the concern is
267 that if a retaining wall is six feet high, there may be a safety issue with animals, children, and
268 adults falling over it.
- 269 • Parties commented on proposed retaining wall height and what would be recommended as the
270 optimal height or restrictions. Commented that the height restriction currently in place is eight
271 feet for single retaining walls. Parties discussed a proposed cumulative twelve feet height for
272 terraced walls. However, if the property is large enough a series of terraced retaining wall with at
273 least double horizontal grade of the vertical side, it can be higher than twelve feet. This rule is

274 not absolute, but it is seen as a solution to many problems so long as it is safe and meets the
275 engineering requirements.

- 276 • The Planning Commission agreed that they like the terrace walls that allow for walls to be higher
277 so long as the horizontal is double. Parties acknowledge that they may not want people to end up
278 with fifty-foot walls, but they believe that having a terraced wall spread out on the property
279 could help. They also mentioned that the new rule would make it safer if the minimum horizontal
280 distance was doubled the vertical, but they must have at least a minimum. The parties discussed
281 making the code consistent and in line with other retaining wall codes other cities have in the
282 valley.
- 283 • The Planning Commission noted the importance of recorded easements in property agreements,
284 as it prevents the possibility of disagreements between neighbors. If a neighbor agrees to build a
285 retaining wall, they must put their name on the line, which is crucial for future buyers. The
286 ordinance also clarifies that when building on the property line with both parties, the height of
287 the wall can be eight feet.
- 288 • The parties continued discussion of wall heights. The maximum height for a retaining wall can
289 vary depending on the elevation of the property. For example, if property A is on the downside
290 with an exposed side of eight feet and property B is on the upside with an exposed side of only
291 four feet, the wall height would measure from the exposed sides final grade to the top of the wall.
- 292 • Skarlet discussed the requirements for a single retaining wall on a property line. The retaining
293 wall must not exceed eight feet, and it is important to harmonize the requirements between the
294 setback and the middle of the property lines. If the retaining wall is on the property line, it is still
295 in the setback unless an agreement is made, which can be either six or eight feet. If it is on the
296 rear or non-street side setback, retaining walls greater than six feet where the exposed side of the
297 wall faces out are subject to the same requirements as the main structure.
- 298 • Loretta Buckley commented on retaining wall and fence heights and the need to go higher in
299 some properties that have animals, notes that if the fence or wall is too low the animals can get
300 over it. Also commented on the importance of obtaining topo surveys when people go to buy a
301 house or a lot.
- 302 • Parties discussed retaining walls on slopes or where there is a difference in elevation along the
303 retaining wall making the wall vary in size which would require footings to follow the contour of
304 the slope and the wall would be measured from the base of the slope.
- 305 • Parties talked about the engineering requirements. Parties continued discussion of terraced walls.
- 306 • Parties discussed the necessity of engineering for permanent loads, such as protection systems
307 against slope erosion and adjacent structures. If a load is present, such as a building or
308 something, it may be necessary to have an engineering design. For example, if a two and a half-
309 foot wall is only five feet away from a house, it may not be suitable. However, if a retaining wall
310 is needed for a side yard, it should be the same distance as the main structure. Skarlet noted that
311 in some cases, a retaining wall can be used to create an entryway with stairs that go up part of the
312 wall, which is right next to the house and only four or five feet away depending on how the steps
313 are designed. Parties also emphasized the importance of being site-specific in engineering
314 design, as it helps to ensure that the design is tailored to the specific needs of the site.
- 315 • The Planning Commission commented on allowing for other options, other than just landscaping
316 to help prevent issues or erosion such as pickleball or basketball courts, artificial turf, drip
317 systems, and other sustainable practices.
- 318 • Parties talked about the design engineer being required to conduct regular inspections during the
319 construction of a wall and provide a final report that is certified. This information should be

320 recorded and accessible for property owners, buyers, and sellers. The recommendation is to
321 include all engineering drawings in the building permit application, including any modifications
322 made along the way.

- 323 • Bob Washburn commented that part of the code seems too technical and that it didn't belong as
324 it seems like it clutters the code, suggested that it be placed in one of the manuals or guidelines
325 that the city or public works uses. Mrs. Bankhead responded that it has to be detailed to show
326 what is required and that a lot of developers or engineers use the code for reference for
327 understanding the required wording and requirements. Loretta Buckley pointed out that the terms
328 listed in the code are not mentioned in any significant engineering studies, suggesting that the
329 information may be outdated. Suggested that the city engineer review the code and identify
330 which terms are not common.
- 331 • Parties discussed engineering reports, soil testing and other studies that could be done to make
332 sure lots are safe.

333 **Motion to recommend to City Council that they approve the code amendments to PCC 10-8-3 as**
334 **shown in item 7 in accordance with the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions as found in**
335 **the staff report – Rober Henke. 2nd - Bob Washburn.**

336 **Vote:**

337 **Yea- Robert Henke, Michale Fortune, Bob Washburn & Shelly Nazer (Via Phone)**

338 **Nay-**

339 **Abstained-**

340 **Absent- Joe Chambers & Brian Marble.**

341
342 **Motion passes.**

343
344 ➤ **Item No. 8 PCC Amendments regarding Sign Regulations:** The Providence City Planning
345 Commission will review, discuss, and may make a recommendation to the City Council regarding
346 proposed changes to the city code regarding sign regulations. **(EXHIBIT)**

- 348 • Michael Fortune called item 8, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an
349 overview of the amendments.
- 350 • Skarlet Bankhead noted that this item was on the agenda at the last meeting and that it is being
351 brought back to the Planning Commission with their recommended changes from that meeting.
- 352 • Bob Washburn asked if they need to address temporary electronic message boards that are
353 usually found on streets to direct traffic or warn of construction. Also asked about wall signs and
354 if painted on signs counted or were regulated. Mrs. Bankhead responded that she could include a
355 section specific to traffic control signs but that the temporary sign section should cover that but if
356 its utilized by UDOT they may have their own regulations. She noted that painted wall signs are
357 covered, like that one at Macys but that wall murals or art are not covered or included. Parties
358 discussed advertisements versus wall murals. Skarlet commented that she could include a section
359 about wall murals or wall art.
- 360 • Parties talked about roof signs and regulating them. Discussed doing more research.
- 361 • The Planning Commission discussed incandescent illumination and wondered if they should just
362 strike incandescent and make it less specific. Parties agreed that making it more general would
363 be beneficial.

- 364
- 365
- 366
- 367
- Parties talked about bringing this back with their recommendations or approving it with their recommendations stated in the motion. The Planning Commission agree to move it to City Council.

368 **Motion to recommend to City Council that they approve PCC amendments regarding Sign**
369 **Regulations with the before mentioned recommended changes in accordance with the findings of**
370 **facts, conclusions of law and conditions as found in the staff report – Bob Washburn. 2nd – Robert**
371 **Henke.**

372 **Vote:**

373 **Yea- Robert Henke, Michale Fortune, Bob Washburn & Shelly Nazer (Via Phone)**

374 **Nay-**

375 **Abstained-**

376 **Absent- Joe Chambers & Brian Marble.**

377

378 **Motion passes.**

379

380 **Administrative Action Item(s):** None

381

382 **Study Items(s):**

- 383
- 384 ➤ **Item No. 9 PCC Amendments Regarding the Use and Construction of Retaining Walls:** The
385 Providence Planning Commission will review and discuss proposed changes to the city code that regulates
386 the use and construction of retaining walls and make any recommended changes or suggestions.
387 **(EXHIBIT)**

- 388
- This item was called and discussed with item 7. The Planning Commission moved that staff make the recommend changes and updates per their discussion and bring this back in a future meeting to review and further discuss.

389

390

391


392

393

394 **Minutes approved by vote of Planning Commission on 27th day of March 2024.**

395


Michael Fortune, Chair


Ty Cameron, City Recorder

396

397

398

399 **Emailed Comments.**

400

401 Hello,

402

403 I cannot attend tonight's meeting, but I wanted to propose that the size of the park strip be taken into
404 account in the proposed rules. For neighborhoods with very large park strips, the proposed rules

405 result in a very large triangle that is more than enough for clear views and could prevent owners from
406 planting trees in park strips that still preserve plenty of visibility.

407
408 I propose instead that the edge of the triangle be the maximum of a) the triangle formed by 25'
409 measured from the property line/city right of way and b) the triangle formed by 30' from the edge of
410 the street. In this case, the triangle would have a side length at least 30' away from the street, but
411 wouldn't make it as large if the park strip is large. This would still provide plenty of visibility for
412 pedestrians and drivers.

413
414 Thank you,

415
416 Kevin Moon