

Administrative Land Use Authority (ALUA)

MINTUES –Oct. 15th, 2025 – 2:30 pm

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

Call to Order: Skarlet Bankhead, Chair

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

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

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

Motion to approve the minutes of September 24th, 2025 – Steven Wood, 2nd- Rob Stapley.

Vote-

Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Steven Wood & Rob Stapley.

Nay-

Abstained-

Absent-

Motion passes, minutes approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

103 **Vote-**

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

105 **Nay-**

106 **Abstained-**

107 **Absent-**

109 **Motion passes, site plan approved.**

111 **Motion to adjourn meeting. – Rob Stapley. 2nd- Steven Wood**

112 **Vote-**

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

114 **Nay-**

115 **Abstained-**

116 **Absent-**

118 **Motion passes, meeting adjourned.**

120 **Minutes approved by vote of commission on _____ day of _____ 2025.**

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

131 **Ty Cameron City Recorder.**