

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Wednesday, December 10th, 2025, 6:00 pm

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

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

HR. MIN. SEC. above agenda items are timestamps of the YouTube recording.

Call to Order: Robert Henke

Chair Roll Call of Commission Members: Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.

Commission Members Absent : Julie Martin & Michael Fortune.

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

Pledge of Allegiance: Joe Chambers

1 MIN. 55 SEC.

- **Item No. 1 Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes of November 19th, 2025. [\(MINUTES\)](#)

- Chair Henke called for the approval of the minutes of November 19th, 2025.

Motion to approve the minutes of November 19th, 2025 – Bob Perry. 2nd- John Petersen.

Vote:

Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.

Nay-

Abstained-

Motion passed unanimously, minutes approved.

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

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

- Chair Henke opened the floor for public comments, noting that citizens can express their views on issues within the Providence or the Planning Commission's jurisdiction.
- No citizens had signed up to provide public comment, either in person or online. Staff confirmed they had checked online comments before the meeting and found none.
- City Manager Ryan Snow raised a procedural question about the placement of public comments on the agenda, noting there had been some discussion about moving the item to the end of the agenda. The suggestion was to consider having public comments after those with appointments to avoid delays.
- Chair Henke responded that the commission hasn't normally had many public comments unless there's a public hearing, so he didn't think it delayed meetings significantly. He asked for other thoughts on the matter.
- Bob Perry agreed, noting he didn't see any issues and thought it unfair for the public to wait till the end of the meeting to make a 2-minute comment.

- After brief discussion, Chair Henke decided to leave it the way it is for now, thanking staff for bringing up the issue.

Administrative Action Item(s):

5 MIN. 00 SEC.

- **Item No. 2 Preliminary Plat South Edgehill Subdivision:** The Providence City Planning Commission will review, discuss and may approve a preliminary plat for the South Edgehill Subdivision. ([EXHIBIT](#))

- The Planning Commission reviewed a preliminary plat for a 2-lot subdivision located in the general area of 531 South Edge Hill Drive. Skarlet Bankhead presented the item along with Tom Hill, the design engineer. The applicant was also present via Zoom.
- Skarlet began by reminding the commission that this is an administrative item which means if they meet the code then they get approved. She explained that both lots would enter from Edge Hill Drive and would not utilize 100 East, though the property extends from Edge Hill Drive down over the hill to 100 East.
- The staff report covered several key areas:
 - General Plan Compliance: The area is designated as neighborhood residential in the general plan, which allows for locations of existing and potential new residential development, neighborhoods and residential development that may consist of one housing type or a mix of housing type. The new lot being created would be approximately 12,000-13,000 square feet (0.298 acres), which is standard sized for an R-1-12 area.
 - Transportation and Trail Considerations: Edge Hill Drive is a local road without limited access, so adding another driveway would be acceptable. However, 100 East is shown as a major collector with limited access. Skarlet noted there's a little bit of difference between what our general plan is and our master plan regarding this road classification.
 - Infrastructure Requirements: The area is included in the 40-year water plan and wastewater master plan. Impact fees would be charged when building permits are applied for. The plan shows stormwater improvements including detention areas and piping. However, the developer needs to submit water availability information using the state's generic formula referenced in city code.
- A significant discussion emerged about the city's trail system. Ryan Snow explained that the city is developing a trail from Edge Hill Drive to 100 East, with the trailhead located around 465 Edge Hill Drive. He detailed the trail route starting from the elementary school, proceeding down to Fourth, crossing Fourth, then coming through city-owned property. The city owns three parcels to facilitate the trail connection, though the steep slopes will require switchbacks.
- Ryan emphasized that developing a sidewalk along the west side of Edge Hill Drive will promote pedestrian traffic to access the trail. This sidewalk would be the developer's responsibility for their frontage, as the city fills in trail gaps through development as properties come forward.
- Skarlet went through the city code as a checklist, noting several items needing attention:

- The need to show all non-developable sensitive areas (steep slopes were shown in a GIS parcel summary but not on the actual plat)
- Permanent buildings and structures on adjacent properties within 100 feet were not shown
- Engineering review comments about utilities, ditches, and canals needed to be addressed
- The placement of public utility easements needed clarification
- No dedication was shown for 100 East right-of-way
- A detailed discussion ensued about the required right-of-way for 100 East. Staff confirmed that while it's currently an 80-foot right-of-way, the city would require 66 feet. Tom Hill asked about the specific requirements, particularly regarding the curb and gutter on Edge Hill not matching standard cross-section widths. The park strip would be 5 feet instead of the standard 7 feet, which staff said they would need to verify with the appropriate personnel.
- Joe Chambers raised significant concern about the north property boundary. Looking at the GIS viewer, he noted that the lines didn't seem to match up. He observed that the neighbor appeared to be using property south of their driveway, with landscaping extending 10-15 feet into what might be the subject property. This led to an extended discussion about boundary lines and potential encroachments.
- Tom Hill responded that the surveyor, Clint Hansen, had established the boundary and noted a fence line on the plat that appears to align with or be slightly north of the property line. He offered to check the surveyor's field notes for more detail about what monuments were found and how the boundary was established.
- Ben Maun, a neighbor living at 540 Edge Hill Drive since 1984, came forward during the discussion. He expressed interest in understanding the proposal, noting his family's long history in the area and that he had seen it sit vacant for many years. He clarified the fence situation, explaining there are two fences: a black chain link installed by the property owner in question, and a white vinyl fence between the houses installed by the Thompsons to the north.
- Tom Hill stated that his office has reviewed all the comments and found nothing really too concerning and are planning on taking care of all of them.
- Skarlet presented three conditions for approval:
 - Address the comments in red in the conclusion section
 - Address the comments in the engineering review
 - Address the comments in the fire review
- She explained the commission's options are to approve with conditions, continue for more information, or approve as-is. If approved with conditions, staff would follow up to ensure the preliminary plat is correct before proceeding to the final plat process with construction drawings.

Motion to continue and get some clarification and allow time for the red items to be addressed so the next time it comes back to us it's cleaner. – Joe Chambers. 2nd- Bob Perry.

Vote:

Yea- Bob Perry, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.

Nay- John Petersen

Abstained-

Motion passed, item continued.

Study Items(s):

46 MIN. 30 SEC.

- **Item No. 3 PCC 10-8-10 Affordable Housing Incentives code addition:** The Planning Commission will discuss, review and may move forward with setting a public hearing regarding PCC 10-8-10 Affordable Housing Incentives. **(CODE REVIEW)**
- The Planning Commission discussed proposed code amendments for affordable housing incentives. Skarlet presented the draft ordinance, explaining that one of the things that the state is really encouraging is that cities put some type of incentive program in that ordinance to help incentivize developers or home builders to be comfortable with entering into moderate income housing and creating product that would be attainable housing.
 - She emphasized two key state priorities creating moderate income housing and promoting home ownership, noting the other thing that's very important to the governor particularly, but it's also in the state legislature is home ownership.
 - Skarlet researched several cities' approaches and developed a proposal based on Providence's general plan and affordable housing plan.
 - The intent of this code is to support the overall goal of the moderate-income housing element of the general plan by promoting development that provides attractively designed and constructed housing that increases the availability of housing, promotes affordable housing, promotes home ownership, and promotes conservation of resources such as water through efficient land use.
 - **Density Incentive Requirements:**
 - Minimum 20% of proposed units must meet moderate income housing requirements
 - Moderate income housing is defined as housing for households with gross income no more than 80% of Cache County's median gross income
 - A deed restriction would be required for at least 5 years ensuring units continue to meet moderate income thresholds
 - When asked about current income levels, Skarlet indicated the 80% mark is around \$63,000, though Bob Perry noted the general plan report shows \$73,000 as median income. Skarlet also shared that she had heard on a podcast that "in Utah, homes are 6 times the income level of people in Utah. Instead of just 3 times, they're 6 times."
 - **Development Standards for Incentive Projects:**
 - 20% density increase allowed for qualifying developments
 - Lots for moderate income units can be no less than 80% of base lot size
 - Front, side street, and rear setbacks must meet base minimums
 - Interior side yards must be no less than 80% of base setback or 5 feet, whichever is more
 - Twin homes may have one 0-foot interior side setback
 - **Zone-Specific Provisions:**
 - Planned Unit Developments: Could receive an additional 15% density bonus (25% total) if they include moderate income housing
 - Life Cycle Residential: Maximum density could increase to 15 units per net acre
 - Mixed Use District: Horizontal development could increase to 30 units per acre; vertical development to 40 units per acre

- The proposal included provisions for creating home ownership promotion zones of 10 contiguous acres or less, following Utah Code. Joe Chambers compared this to redevelopment areas where the county and the school districts have foregone their portion of the increase to go back into Logan City's development to make improvements within that district. Skarlet confirmed it operates on similar principles but with different numbers than traditional RDAs.
- Chair Henke performed calculations during the discussion, determining that at 5.5% interest, a \$400,000 home would cost about \$2,200 per month, which would be almost affordable for someone at the 80% income level. He expressed skepticism.
- Skarlet acknowledged that realistically, I don't think any of the communities that have already put these kinds of incentives in are seeing people beat the door down to utilize them. But this is a start.
- The commission discussed enforcement challenges. When asked who would enforce the deed restrictions, Skarlet admitted that's yet to be determined and some of the things that we need to talk about that I'm hoping you have some great ideas on. She noted she sits on a committee and planned to reach out to members about enforcement methods, acknowledging that enforcement is kind of tricky.

Motion to set a hearing on the proposed ordinance. – Joe Chambers. 2nd- Bob Perry.

Vote:

Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.

Nay-

Abstained-

Motion passed unanimously, public hearing to be set in January.

Motion to adjourn meeting. – John Petersen. 2nd- Joe Chambers.

Vote:

Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.

Nay-

Abstained-

Motion passed unanimously, meeting adjourned.

Minutes approved by vote of commission on 14th day of January 2026.

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



Ty Cameron, City Recorder.