

Administrative Land Use Authority (ALUA)

MINUTES –Oct. 29th, 2025 – 2:30 pm

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

Call to Order: Skarlet Bankhead, Chair

- Skarlet Bankhead, Chair, called the Administrative Land Use Authority meeting to order at 2:30 PM on October 29, 2025, at the Providence City Office Building, 164 North Gateway Drive, Providence.
- **Present:** Steven Wood, City Engineer, and Rob Stapley, Public Works Director. Also in attendance were Ryan Snow, City Manager; Ty Cameron, City Recorder; and Colton Love, Stormwater and Zoning Compliance Officer.

Approval of the Minutes: The Administrative Land Use Authority will consider approval of the minutes from October 15th, 2025. [**\(MINUTES\)**](#)

- The Administrative Land Use Authority considered approval of the minutes from October 15th, 2025. Chair Bankhead stated she had no changes to the minutes and asked the other members if they had any changes. Both indicated they had none.

Motion to approve the minutes of October 15th, 2025. – Rob Stapley. 2nd – Steven Wood.

Vote:

Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Rob Stapley & Steven Wood.

Nay-

Abstained-

Absent-

Motion passed unanimously. Minutes approved.

➤ **Item No. 1 Bouwes Subdivision Amendment:** ALUA will review, discuss and may approve a final plat for Bouwes Subdivision Amendment 1, splitting Lot 3 into two lots. Located at 441 S 100 W, Providence. **(STAFF REPORT)** & **(EXHIBIT)**

- Skarlet Bankhead called item 1 and asked Colton Love to give an overview of the application.
- Colton Love, Land Use Specialist, introduced the application for the Bouwes Subdivision Amendment Number 1, which would split lot 3 into two lots at 441 South 100 West in Providence. He explained that the applicant was requesting approval to change the number of lots within the subdivision by subdividing one or more lots. The most recent application was received on October 14th, 2025, and included the Providence City final/amended subdivision plat application, site plan, and petition to amend a subdivision. Aaron Walker, Deputy Fire Marshal, reviewed the site and provided a letter dated July 3rd, 2025.
- Colton outlined the relevant regulations, including Utah Code Title 10 Chapter 9A Part 6 concerning subdivisions and Providence City Code 2-4-1 establishing the administrative land use authority for all subdivisions. He concluded that Providence City had enacted ordinances requiring subdivision plats to comply with municipal ordinances and state code provisions, and that the proposed final plat was consistent with the general plan and development in the surrounding areas.
- The conditions for approval included the applicant continuing to meet all relevant federal, state, state, county, and Providence City rules, laws, codes, and ordinances; coordination with the

47 irrigation company; necessary stormwater calculations; showing of all public utility easements;
48 determining building envelopes with fire access restrictions; and any additional conditions the
49 land use authority may require.

- 50 • When asked if he had questions, John, the applicant, indicated he had none at that time. Skarlet
51 Bankhead reviewed the submitted materials, noting they had received the letter from Blacksmith
52 Fork Irrigation Company, stormwater information, and that public utility easements were shown
53 on the plat. She mentioned they would discuss fire protection areas and whether cost estimates
54 would be needed, which John confirmed had not been submitted as they hadn't been requested.
- 55 • Skarlet noted that while CenturyLink signatures were no longer needed on plats, it would save the
56 applicant a signature. She asked if the stormwater information provided was adequate. Steven
57 Wood inquired whether the 0.7-acre calculation was intended to replace the previously provided
58 stormwater calculations for the subdivision. John explained that Jeff Seedall from Crossroads
59 Engineering had reviewed the previous calculations and determined that even with additional
60 hardscaping, the previous calculations remained feasible for the lot.
- 61 • Steven Wood asked for clarification about which acreage was being considered for the
62 stormwater evaluation. Skarlet explained that the original development had made provisions for
63 stormwater, and Mr. Bouwes needed to determine whether adding another home with hardscape
64 would require additional stormwater provisions. John confirmed that the conclusion was that it
65 did require looking at stormwater requirements for the new lot.
- 66 • There was discussion about the detention facility location, with Steven clarifying that the
67 detention facility in the north-northwest corner of lot 5A would provide stormwater retention for
68 lots 5A and 4A specifically, not the entire Bouwes development. He confirmed the calculation
69 method was appropriate for parcels under one acre.
- 70 • Rob Stapley sought clarification about how the approved subdivision construction drawings
71 would need to be modified since they were breaking off a portion for these two individual lots.
72 He noted that the original plans had been designed with all acreage going to one location, but now
73 the stormwater would be handled differently. Steven mentioned that the north two lots should
74 have had a stormwater facility installed when those houses were built, though it met minimum
75 improvements but hadn't been finalized.
- 76 • Steven Wood raised the critical issue of needing a berm on the western edge of lot 5A to prevent
77 stormwater from leaving the western boundary and directing it to the pond. He specified that the
78 berm should be no higher than two feet at the absolute maximum and would need to be contained
79 within an easement so the contours couldn't be altered. Additionally, a note protecting the
80 stormwater easements would need to be added to the plat, stating that contours within the
81 detention pond and easements cannot be altered.
- 82 • Rob Stapley shifted the discussion to the irrigation letter from Blacksmith Fork Irrigation
83 Company, asking John if he had plans to address their concerns. John stated that the main issue
84 voiced by the irrigation company was that they were not responsible for the upkeep, maintenance,
85 or installation of any features. He had no issues with their recommendations to bury the pipes for
86 safety, add additional security for the pipe before the junction box, upgrade the junction box, and
87 install a metal grate over top for protection. Rob confirmed John's plan was to pipe the ditch, alter
88 the junction box to a traffic-rated scenario that would work for water users, and ensure
89 shareholders could continue getting their water safely.
- 90 • Rob mentioned that the sidewalk had been allowed to stop before reaching the property line until
91 something was figured out with the irrigation company. John noted that the existing sidewalk
92 wasn't appropriate for road access and would need to be altered anyway, requiring 20 feet to be

93 modified. Once the pipes were installed, the new driveway would be thicker concrete that could
94 reach the property line.

- 95 • Marsha Hunt, a neighbor to the south, expressed concerns about the irrigation pipes being in
96 jeopardy from development of the barn and driveway, and questioned how the ingress would
97 work with only 21 feet between the barn and the irrigation pipe. She was concerned about
98 equipment coming in that could damage the irrigation infrastructure. Skarlet explained that the
99 construction drawings would show how the pipe would be laid according to Blacksmith Fork
100 Irrigation's requirements. John confirmed that the pipe would be replaced with one better suited
101 for underground situations to provide full access while keeping it as protected as possible.
- 102 • Steven Wood explained there was a documented 20-foot-wide easement on the south edge of the
103 property that would be utilized for both access to the flag lot and as the utility protected easement
104 for the irrigation pipe. The irrigation pipe would be replaced with proper subgrade pipe and
105 buried for protection. Marsha Hunt was satisfied with this explanation.
- 106 • Steven inquired about the all-weather surface plan for the 20-foot-wide access easement, noting it
107 required 75,000-pound capacity. John indicated it would likely be asphalt, though the final
108 decision would be made when the back lot was sold.
- 109 • Skarlet explained that in addition to the stormwater note on the plat, they would need construction
110 drawings showing how to properly install the pipe at the correct location and depth, ensuring the
111 road surface would properly accommodate the water line to the north, irrigation line, and sewer
112 line all in that area. These construction drawings would need to show depths, grades, and how
113 they relate to the sub-base and base for the 75,000-pound capacity driveway.
- 114 • Steven specified that the construction drawings should be an amendment to the approved
115 construction set for the Bouwes development, as the previous developments didn't include
116 infrastructure like piping of the canal or the junction box. Any infrastructure changes from the
117 approved construction drawings would need to be provided to Providence City for attachment to
118 the original drawings.
- 119 • The discussion turned to whether the construction drawings needed to encompass the catch basin,
120 irrigation pipe between the Bouwes and Hunt properties, stormwater detention pond with its
121 grade facilities and emergency overflows, contours and grades, and grading for the berm
122 protecting the western property. It should also provide details on the access road's all-weather
123 surface, whether asphalt or concrete, including road base compaction and depth specifications.
- 124 • Bill, a neighbor on the west side, raised concerns about the sewer line, noting that building a
125 house on the back lot would require going uphill quite a ways to the sewer line on First West.
126 Rob explained that based on elevation and grades, an ejection pump would likely be needed since
127 gravity wouldn't work, but this was very doable and common practice.
- 128 • Bill also asked about plans for the pipe routing irrigation. Steven wanted to ensure the alterations
129 would allow Bill to continue using the irrigation system as he had been. Bill indicated he just
130 wanted assurance the water would get to him and didn't care about other details.
- 131 • Another neighbor inquired about the irrigation junction box, expressing concerns about
132 maintaining access to clean debris from the grate that prevents leaves from filling the box and
133 plugging gates downstream. Rob acknowledged it might not be as easy as before but should
134 remain functional and usable. John stated he was working with Circle B Irrigation to create the
135 box, junctions, and gates to make it as user-friendly as possible, planning to help lift heavy grates
136 when needed. He confirmed there would be a gate to dump water and debris to the north down the
137 ditch.
- 138 • Bill asked about the berm height and pond size. Steven indicated the berm shouldn't be higher
139 than two feet maximum, and the pond would need to hold 980 cubic feet of material in

140 approximately a 20 by 30-foot area, about 1 to 1.5 feet deep in the northwest corner. Bill
141 expressed concerns about drainage, worried that if the pond overflowed, it could flood basements
142 through a historical drainage ditch between houses. Steven explained that construction drawings
143 must be stamped by professional engineers and prove the storm pond drains within 72 hours.

- 144 • Skarlet clarified that stormwater regulations allow historical flow to continue - they cannot
145 increase the rate or amount, but if water has historically flowed somewhere, it may continue to do
146 so. The pond would contain most runoff, but they couldn't guarantee nature wouldn't produce
147 some flow. John emphasized that the pond's purpose was to increase protection rather than add
148 risk, providing another place for water to settle before reaching neighboring properties.
- 149 • When Bill expressed concern about additional concrete and roof area from the new home, Skarlet
150 explained that some retention had already been roughed in when the neighboring house was built
151 as part of the original subdivision, and John was now adding to that retention. Bill confirmed he
152 had understood the pond had been planned all along.
- 153 • Rob asked about pre-construction meeting requirements for an amended piece of the subdivision.
154 Skarlet confirmed that with new construction drawings and a different developer/contractor, they
155 would hold a pre-construction meeting once the drawings were reviewed and signed. This
156 meeting would cover all construction policies before work could begin.
- 157 • Skarlet noted that since they knew this would be an access road, the developer should install 6-
158 inch-thick sidewalk instead of the typical 4-inch. John expressed concern about timing, preferring
159 to install sidewalk toward the end of construction to avoid damage from concrete trucks and
160 heavy equipment. Skarlet explained he could put a bond in place to get the building permit
161 without completing the sidewalk immediately, with up to two years to complete it, though the
162 final inspection would be delayed until sidewalk installation.
- 163 • John asked about required signatures on the plat. Skarlet confirmed he would need to get
164 signatures from Dominion Energy, Rocky Mountain Power, and Providence Fiber (replacing
165 CenturyLink on the plat), while city signatures for culinary water and sanitary sewer would be
166 handled in-house. She also clarified that construction drawings would need to be approved before
167 recording the plat but wouldn't require returning to another ALUA meeting.
- 168 • To summarize the conditions, Skarlet outlined that they needed: a couple of notes changed on the
169 plat including the stormwater contour protection note; the CenturyLink signature changed to
170 Providence Fiber; construction drawings showing the amendments; and completion of these
171 conditions before recording. John confirmed his understanding of the requirements: construction
172 drawings referencing slope and placement of retention pond, hardscape of the road showing how
173 to achieve the required capacity, and details on water, sewer, and irrigation line interplay. He also
174 confirmed that the mylar paper and signatures would come after construction drawing approval.

175 **Motion to approve the Bouwes Subdivision Amendment Number 1 conditionally, with conditions**
176 **that: on the plat, a comment to protect the contours and the stormwater improvements be added; that**
177 **the easements provided contain all areas for the stormwater including the retention pond and the**
178 **berm; that the utility company approval CenturyLink be replaced with Providence Fiber; and that a**
179 **construction drawing plan set be provided for the alterations between the approved construction**
180 **drawings and that which is needed to complete the subdivision amendment as presented. – Steven**
181 **Wood. 2nd- Rob Stapley.**

182 **Vote:**

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

184 **Nay-**

185 **Abstained-**

186 **Absent-**

187
188 **Motion passed unanimously.**

189
190 ➤ **Item No. 2 Homes on Parkway Amended Plat:** ALUA will review, discuss and may approve an
191 amended plat for The Homes on Parkway Phase 2, amendment of lot 2. **(APPLICATION)**

- 193 • Skarlet Bankhead called item 2 and asked Colton Love to give an overview of the application.
- 194 • Colton Love presented the application for the Homes on Parkway Phase 2 amendment of lot 2.
195 He stated the applicant was requesting approval to change the number of lots. The application,
196 received on October 14th, 2025, contained the Providence City final/amended subdivision
197 application, site plan, and petition to amend the subdivision by subdividing one or more lots.
- 198 • He reviewed the same regulatory framework as the previous item, concluding that Providence
199 City had enacted appropriate ordinances and the proposed final plat was consistent with the
200 general plan and surrounding development. Standard conditions applied regarding compliance
201 with all relevant laws and regulations.
- 202 • Skarlet asked Danny if he had questions, to which he replied he didn't think so, adding "good to
203 be back." Skarlet mentioned a grammatical error in note 2 that she had discussed with Danny
204 upon his arrival. She inquired about the addressing system, asking if someone purchasing lot 19
205 would have the address 220 North Spring Creek Parkway, unit 19 or D19. Danny confirmed it
206 would be unit 19, as that's how the post office had been handling it for the past three years with
207 units 1 through 26.
- 208 • Skarlet explained the background of the project to establish it on the record. She noted these
209 buildings were constructed as townhomes with firewalls making them separate units but weren't
210 recorded on the plat that way initially. They were built as townhomes but utilized as an
211 apartment building under one ownership. Now they recorded them as townhomes so they could
212 be sold independently, like what was done on Phase 1 of Homes on Parkway. She confirmed
213 there was no construction needed, and no addressing changes required - just recording individual
214 units. Danny confirmed this was correct.
- 215 • Rob Stapley asked about the HOA arrangements, given his close work with HOA situations.
216 Danny explained that Phase 1 to the north had been sold about a year ago and had an HOA
217 handling all exterior maintenance and irrigation. Phase 2 hadn't had an HOA because it was
218 under single ownership but would now establish one. He would initially be the HOA president
219 managing the funds, with each unit required to pay HOA dues yearly for exterior maintenance.
220 He confirmed nothing would really change in Rob's realm - they would still contact Danny or his
221 HOA representatives for assistance. Danny noted they didn't intend to sell all units and would
222 remain involved for the foreseeable future.
- 223 • Skarlet reminded Danny that he couldn't record the plat until the CC&Rs were ready, though the
224 city didn't need to approve them. Danny acknowledged this, explaining they didn't currently have
225 CC&Rs for Phase 2 since it had been under single ownership, but were creating them.
- 226 • Steven Wood's only question concerned ownership of the common area and how it would be
227 maintained, which Rob had already addressed. Steven then asked about the perimeter public
228 utilities easement (PUE), questioning whether it was previously recorded or considered common
229 area. He wondered if the blanket easement in note 6 giving easements to individual owners was
230 sufficient for Providence City's potential future needs.
- 231 • Rob noted that the typical boundary perimeter PUE for Providence City surrounding utilities
232 appeared to be missing in certain areas. He expressed concern about whether Providence City

would have the right to run utilities like a sewer or water line along the eastern edge of the property if needed in the future. He specifically mentioned the possibility of needing a water line for the new park to provide two feeds for the water service.

- The group discussed whether the blanket easement provided in note 6, which specifically called out water, sewer, storm drainage, gas, telephone, cable, internet, and electrical power, was appropriate for future Providence City needs instead of recording perimeter PUEs. Skarlet reviewed the list and concluded it covered all necessary services. Steven agreed he was satisfied with it after double-checking.
- Rob also pointed out that the plat didn't show the access way in the far southeast corner between the storage units and Homes on Parkway that he had envisioned, with enough room to walk around the corner without crossing boundary fences. Danny acknowledged this and agreed to add it.

Motion to approve the Homes on Parkway amended plat item 2 on the agenda. – Rob Stapley. 2nd- Steven Wood.

Vote:

Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Rob Stapley & Steven Wood.

Nay-

Abstained-

Absent-

Motion passed unanimously.

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

Vote:

Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Rob Stapley & Steven Wood.

Nay-

Abstained-

Absent-

Motion passed unanimously, meeting adjourned.

Minutes approved by ALUA on _____ day of _____ 2025.

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

Ty Cameron, City Recorder.