

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, September 24th, 2025, 6:00 pm

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

4

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

6

7 **Call to Order:** Vice Chair Juile Martin

8 **Chair Roll Call of Commission Members:** Bob Perry, Michael Fortune, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.

9 **Members Excused:** Robert Henke & John Petersen.

10 **Staff in Attendance:** City Manager Ryan Snow, Community Development Director Skarlet Bankhead and City
11 Recorder Ty Cameron

12 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Joe Chambers.

13

14 ➤ **Swearing in of new Planning Commission Member Bob Perry.**

15

16

17

18

- Ty Cameron, City Recorder administered the oath of office to Bob Perry. Bob raised his right hand and solemnly swore to support, obey, and defend the constitution of the United States and the constitution of Utah, and to discharge the duties of his office with fidelity.
- Julie Martin welcomed Bob, noting he had previous experience on the commission.

19

20 ➤ **Item No. 1 Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes of August 27th, 2025. [**\(MINUTES\)**](#)

21

22

23

- Julie Martin called for the approval of the minutes of August 27th, 2025.

24 **Motion to approve the minutes of August 27th, 2025 – Michael Fortune. 2nd- Joe Chambers.**

25 **Vote:**

26 **Yea- Michael Fortune, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

27 **Nay-**

28 **Abstained- Bob Perry.**

29 **Absent- Robert Henke & John Petersen.**

30

31 **Motion passes, minutes approved.**

32

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

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

37

38

39

40

- Julie Martin opened the meeting for public comments.
- No members of the public were present in the audience. Staff confirmed no comments had been received via email or phone.
- The public comment portion was closed.

42 **Public Hearings:** None

43 **Legislative – Action Item(s):** None

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

45 **Study Items(s):**

46 ➤ **Item No. 2 PCC Addition - PCC 10-9-8 Mining and Similar Activities:** The Providence City
 47 Planning Commission will review, discuss and may set for a public hearing a proposed new code to the
 48 Providence City Code; 10-9-8 Mining and Similar Activities. [**\(PCC 10-9-8\)**](#)

- 51 • Julie Martin introduced this as a study item for a new code or code revision regarding mining
 52 and similar activities. No action would be taken at this meeting other than moving to the next
 53 step which would be a public hearing.
- 54 • Community Development Director Skarlet Bankhead presented the proposed code. She
 55 explained that state code changes made in May by "critical materials people" - the large gravel
 56 pit operators like Geneva Rock - necessitated updating Providence City's code. The city
 57 previously had mining regulations that were inadvertently omitted during codification. Given the
 58 state's more liberal stance toward mining activities, the city needed regulations to protect
 59 residential neighborhoods while allowing developers to utilize natural resources.
- 60 • Skarlet explained she based the proposed code on the previous ordinance from 2021-2022, with
 61 additions including provisions for temporary gravel pits - something not in the previous code but
 62 found in other counties. She emphasized the focus on temporary pits associated with subdivision
 63 development, allowing developers to use on-site materials for infrastructure.
- 64 • The recent catalyst was a developer in the southeast portion of the city who had been operating
 65 for several months using materials on-site. While the operation itself generated few complaints,
 66 issues arose when large truck traffic began transporting materials off-site. Skarlet noted that the
 67 minute the large truck traffic started happening off-site to and from the site, that's when people
 68 started noticing something was up.
- 69 • Skarlet then presented her recent idea about the need for more detailed traffic plan requirements.
 70 She proposed including specific elements: haul routes with maps and narrative, traffic safety
 71 measures, hours of operation, roadway protection and maintenance, truck staging and idling plan,
 72 communication and coordination procedures, and compliance and monitoring plan. These would
 73 be separate from the overall business plan, recognizing that pit operations might run 7 AM to 5
 74 PM while truck hauling could occur 9 AM to 6 PM.
- 75 • Michael Fortune commented that he supported the traffic plan additions, noting the issues caused
 76 by gravel pits in Cache Valley and the Brigham City/Perry area.
- 77 • Joe Chambers inquired about the location, learning it was in the southeast portion of the city,
 78 south of Providence Canyon, near 8th East. When the discussion turned to access roads, Skarlet
 79 clarified that trucks enter at 8th East and travel south directly to the site.
- 80 • Joe Chambers raised concerns about state legislation allowing expansion of operations with
 81 conditional use permits. He explained that under recent bills, if a conditional use permit exists,
 82 operators can acquire adjacent land before January 2026, and cities cannot deny expansion unless
 83 there are severe safety concerns that cannot be mitigated. As someone who had represented
 84 gravel pits since 1998, Joe noted he was familiar with large clients planning to use this
 85 legislation.

86

- Skarlet committed to consulting with the city attorney about whether a conditional use permit
87 was appropriate given Joe's concerns about expansion rights. Parties suggested they might need
88 a different type of permit to avoid triggering state protections for mining operations.
- Julie Martin asked several clarifying questions. She wanted to know if "temporary" was defined
89 elsewhere in code regarding duration and volume. Skarlet acknowledged this was a good point
90 needing definition. Julie also asked about the annual review process - how it would be conducted
91 and what would trigger permit revocation. Skarlet explained that operators would need to prove
92 continued adherence to established conditions, and permits could be denied if they moved to
93 locations where detrimental effects on neighborhoods couldn't be mitigated.
- Julie expressed concern about indefinite renewals of temporary permits, asking if there was a cap
94 on how many years operations could continue. Skarlet agreed this should be addressed in
95 defining "temporary."
- Julie also asked about penalties for violations. Skarlet explained these were covered in Title I of
96 city code, with options for infractions, Class C misdemeanors, and Class B misdemeanors.
- Joe questioned the administrative land use authority designation. The code showed city council
100 approval on line 18 but administrative land use authority on line 50. Skarlet clarified this was an
101 error - it should all be administrative land use authority, consisting of the Community
102 Development Director, Public Works Director, and City Engineer.
- When Joe Chambers asked why Planning Commission was not involved any more. Skarlet
104 explained the history stating that when the code changed around 2006 encouraging cities to
105 remove city councils from administrative processes, they created the administrative land use
106 authority. Since the Planning Commission was more involved in subdivisions, they excluded
107 commission members to avoid conflicts of interest. Now Planning Commission only handles
108 preliminary plats and multi-family design review, plus legislative matters like ordinances.
109 Skarlet noted the three professionals were chosen for their expertise in analyzing technical
110 aspects like traffic and business plans.
- Commission raised technical concerns about slope stability, noting that state Division of Oil, Gas
113 and Mining (DOGM) defaults to 1:1 slopes (45 degrees) while the proposed code allowed
114 disturbing up to 30% grades (approximately 3:1). They suggested this seemed very steep without
115 engineering certification. The discussion became detailed about slope calculations and safety.
- Skarlet explained the 30% threshold came from their sensitive areas designation - they cannot
116 disturb slopes of 30% or greater, though they could create up to 28% slopes if stabilized. Parties
117 suggested incorporating engineering requirements for slope design during active excavation, not
118 just final grading. They discussed various scenarios, including a Pleasant View example where
119 engineers certified very steep rock faces for a future golf course.
- Skarlet agreed to consult with the city engineer about appropriate slope stability requirements,
122 acknowledging the need to protect both workers during active operations and future residents.
- Michael Fortune shared his perspective as someone less familiar with the topic, mentioning the
124 inactive pit in Hyrum (now owned by LeGrand Johnson). Discussion revealed the LeGrand
125 Johnson pit remains very active with trucks entering from the highway. Michael supported the
126 proposed code revisions with suggested improvements, emphasizing the temporary nature -
127 allowing developers to use on-site materials for their projects and remove excess, not operate
128 commercial gravel pits. If developers wanted commercial operations, they would need additional
129 business licensing. He felt comfortable moving to public hearing to gather community input
130 while continuing to refine the code.
- The commission discussed timing for a public hearing.
- Julie Martin expressed comfort, moving to public hearing since no final decisions would be
133 made and work would continue, if necessary, after the public give input.

135 **Vote:**

136 **Yea- Bob Perry, Michael Fortune, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

137 **Nay-**

138 **Abstained-**

139 **Absent- Robert Henke & John Petersen.**

140

141 **Motion passes, item to be set for a public hearing.**

142 **Julie Martin adjourned the meeting.**

143

144 **Next scheduled PC meeting will be October 8th @ 6 pm.**

145 **Minutes approved by vote of Planning Commission on _____ day of _____ 2025.**

146

147 **I swear that these minutes are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.**

148

149 _____

150 **Ty Cameron, City Recorder.**

151

152

153

154

155

156