

1 **Administrative Land Use Authority (ALUA)**

2 **MINTUES –Oct. 15th, 2025 – 2:30 pm**

3 Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence UT 84332

6 **Call to Order:** Skarlet Bankhead, Chair

- 7 • The Providence City Administrative Land Use Authority meeting was called to order on October 15,  
8 2025, at 2:30 PM at the Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence, UT.  
9 Skarlet Bankhead, Community Development Director, chaired the meeting. Also present were Rob  
10 Stapley and Steven Wood as ALUA members, along with Ty Cameron, City Recorder, and Colton  
11 Love, Zoning and Storm Water Technician.

12  
13 **Approval of the Minutes:** The Administrative Land Use Authority will consider approval of the minutes from  
14 September 24th, 2025. [\(MINUTES\)](#)

- 15 • The Administrative Land Use Authority reviewed the minutes from the September 24, 2025, meeting.  
16 Rob Stapley indicated he had no changes, and Steven Wood confirmed he also had no changes after  
17 reading through them.

18 **Motion to approve the minutes of September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2025 – Steven Wood. 2<sup>nd</sup>- Rob Stapley.**

19 **Vote-**

20 **Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Steven Wood & Rob Stapley.**

21 **Nay-**

22 **Abstained-**

23 **Absent-**

24  
25 **Motion passes, minutes approved.**

- 26  
27 ➤ **Item No. 1 Stack Built LLC Commercial Office Building Update:** The ALUA will review,  
28 discuss and may take action on site plans from Stack Built LLC for a Commercial Office Building  
29 located in the general area of 512 W 100 N Providence City, UT. [\(STAFF REPORT\)](#)

- 30 • The Administrative Land Use Authority reviewed the site plans from Stack Built LLC for a commercial  
31 office building located in the general area of 512 West 100 North in Providence. Danny McFarlane and  
32 Ashton McFarlane were present as representatives of the development.
- 33 • Skarlet Bankhead opened the discussion by noting that the landscape percentages shown on the site plan  
34 hadn't changed despite additional landscaping being added. She observed that the percentages should  
35 have increased with the new landscaping areas. Danny McFarlane acknowledged that Civil Solutions  
36 likely hadn't updated the building percentage calculations on the plans and offered to have them make  
37 that change. Rather than requiring a completely revised plan, Mrs. Bankhead requested that updated  
38 numbers be emailed to reflect the actual landscaping percentages.
- 39 • Steven Wood had performed calculations on the landscaping areas, identifying specific square footages:  
40 the southern area with a tree measured approximately 240 square feet, another southern area with a large  
41 tree was 117 square feet, the primary landscaping area was 695 square feet, and the dry landscaping area  
42 was 1,000 square feet. He noted that without the dry landscaping, the project would be below the  
43 required percentage, but with it included, they exceeded requirements.
- 44 • The discussion then shifted to the unique aspect of the proposal - landscaping underneath the elevated  
45 building. Mr. Wood expressed concerns about whether this approach met the intent of the landscaping

ordinance, particularly regarding the purpose of landscaping as described in the code. He read from code section 10-8-5-C, which outlined design initiatives for establishing landscape themes, promoting the community's character and identity, encouraging water and energy conservation, ensuring long-term health of plant materials, and screening unsightly buildings or equipment.

- Danny McFarlane explained that the building would be raised approximately 18 inches off the ground, creating a 9-and-a-half-foot deep space on the west side and a 5-foot deep space on the east side. He argued that the code specified requirements for the number of shrubs and trees but didn't dictate exactly where they needed to be placed on the site. He suggested that shade-tolerant plants could be installed in these under-building areas and maintained that there was nothing in the code prohibiting this approach.
- Mr. Wood remained skeptical, stating that the landscaping under the building wouldn't be visible without crawling underneath to look at it, and he questioned whether it truly served the visual improvement purpose intended by the landscaping requirements. Mr. McFarlane countered that this was a matter of opinion and that decorative rock with shade plants could be aesthetically pleasing. He compared it to maintaining gravel under a porch, suggesting it was a feasible maintenance scenario.
- The conversation turned to parking and traffic flow concerns. Mr. Wood noted that the code required 53 feet for 45-degree parking from curb face to curb face, but the site only provided about 30 feet at its widest point, or 45 feet on the diagonal. Mr. McFarlane argued that the 53-foot requirement was for double-sided parking aisles and that their design featured one-way traffic with 45-degree parking on one side only. He insisted that the 11-foot drive aisle was adequate for this configuration.
- Mrs. Bankhead expressed particular concern about the tight turning radiuses, sharing that another commercial business in Providence with code-compliant parking was experiencing difficulties with vehicles backing out safely. She worried that this project, with even less maneuvering room, could create unsafe conditions. The other business had requested to remove landscaping to create more space, which she had denied, requiring them to maintain code compliance. Her concern was that while other parking areas in the city typically had extra room where drivers could "cheat" into adjacent areas, this site offered no such flexibility.
- The discussion then addressed setback requirements. Initially, there was confusion about whether the 5-foot side yard setback was appropriate. After extensive review of the mixed-use district code and commercial zoning requirements, they determined that the code allowed for a 5-foot setback if the building had a fire-rated wall when adjacent to non-residential uses. Mr. McFarlane confirmed they would provide the necessary fire-rated wall on the east side.
- Mr. Wood suggested a creative solution to improve the under-building landscaping visibility: excavating the area slightly to create a depression, which would provide more vertical space and make the landscaping more visible and accessible. Mr. McFarlane was receptive to this idea, suggesting they could lower the grade by 9 inches to a foot while ensuring proper drainage away from the building foundation.
- Rob Stapley expressed optimism about the creative approach but shared Mr. Wood's concerns about setting precedents for future developments. Mr. Wood emphasized that his objections weren't personal but rather focused on ensuring the city had defensible code interpretations that wouldn't create problematic precedents.
- To address concerns about future maintenance and compliance, Mr. McFarlane offered to record a document with the property that would require future owners to maintain the under-building landscaping. He even suggested, somewhat humorously, placing signs under the building stating that the landscaping was there to meet code requirements and should not be removed.
- The group also discussed additional requirements including bicycle parking, electric vehicle charging stations, snow storage, and garbage storage areas, all of which Danny McFarlane indicated had been

addressed in their plans. They confirmed that a flow test had been conducted showing fire hydrant flow exceeded 4,000 gallons per minute, meeting fire protection requirements.

- After extensive deliberation about whether the unique landscaping approach met code requirements and concerns about the tight parking configuration, the ALUA members reached a consensus that they were willing to approve the project conditionally.

**Motion that the Stack Built office building application as it stands be conditionally approved with the fulfillment of all outstanding items required for a commercial building such as a landscape plan, stormwater calculations, and full civil site plans as typical for any other commercial development, as well as a verification recorded document of the necessity of the unique placement of the landscaping on this site. He also recommended that a small traffic vehicle tracking analysis be performed. – Steven Wood. 2<sup>nd</sup>- Rob Stapley.**

**Vote-**

**Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Steven Wood & Rob Stapley.**

**Nay-**

**Abstained-**

**Absent-**

**Motion passes, site plan approved.**

**Motion to adjourn meeting. – Rob Stapley. 2<sup>nd</sup>- Steven Wood**

**Vote-**

**Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Steven Wood & Rob Stapley.**

**Nay-**

**Abstained-**

**Absent-**

**Motion passes, meeting adjourned.**

**Minutes approved by vote of commission on \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2025.**

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

---

**Ty Cameron City Recorder.**