

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, December 10th, 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 **HR. MIN. SEC.** above agenda items are timestamps of the YouTube recording.

8

9 **Call to Order:** Robert Henke

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

11 **Commission Members Absent :** Julie Martin & Michael Fortune.

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

14 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Joe Chambers

15

16 **1 MIN. 55 SEC.**

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

19

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

21

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

23 **Vote:**

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

25 **Nay-**

26 **Abstained-**

27

28 **Motion passed unanimously, minutes approved.**

29

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

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

34

35 • Chair Henke opened the floor for public comments, noting that citizens can express their views
36 on issues within the Providence or the Planning Commission's jurisdiction.

37 • No citizens had signed up to provide public comment, either in person or online. Staff confirmed
38 they had checked online comments before the meeting and found none.

39 • City Manager Ryan Snow raised a procedural question about the placement of public comments
40 on the agenda, noting there had been some discussion about moving the item to the end of the
41 agenda. The suggestion was to consider having public comments after those with appointments
42 to avoid delays.

43 • Chair Henke responded that the commission hasn't normally had many public comments unless
44 there's a public hearing, so he didn't think it delayed meetings significantly. He asked for other
45 thoughts on the matter.

46 • 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.

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

49 **Administrative Action Item(s):**

50 **5 MIN. 00 SEC.**

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

54

55 • The Planning Commission reviewed a preliminary plat for a 2-lot subdivision located in the
56 general area of 531 South Edge Hill Drive. Skarlet Bankhead presented the item along with Tom
57 Hill, the design engineer. The applicant was also present via Zoom.

58 • Skarlet began by reminding the commission that this is an administrative item which means if
59 they meet the code then they get approved. She explained that both lots would enter from Edge
60 Hill Drive and would not utilize 100 East, though the property extends from Edge Hill Drive
61 down over the hill to 100 East.

62 • The staff report covered several key areas:

- 63 ○ General Plan Compliance: The area is designated as neighborhood residential in the
64 general plan, which allows for locations of existing and potential new residential
65 development, neighborhoods and residential development that may consist of one
66 housing type or a mix of housing type. The new lot being created would be
67 approximately 12,000-13,000 square feet (0.298 acres), which is standard sized for an R-
68 1-12 area.
- 69 ○ Transportation and Trail Considerations: Edge Hill Drive is a local road without limited
70 access, so adding another driveway would be acceptable. However, 100 East is shown as
71 a major collector with limited access. Skarlet noted there's a little bit of difference
72 between what our general plan is and our master plan regarding this road classification.
- 73 ○ Infrastructure Requirements: The area is included in the 40-year water plan and
74 wastewater master plan. Impact fees would be charged when building permits are applied
75 for. The plan shows stormwater improvements including detention areas and piping.
76 However, the developer needs to submit water availability information using the state's
77 generic formula referenced in city code.

78 • A significant discussion emerged about the city's trail system. Ryan Snow explained that the city
79 is developing a trail from Edge Hill Drive to 100 East, with the trailhead located around 465
80 Edge Hill Drive. He detailed the trail route starting from the elementary school, proceeding down
81 to Fourth, crossing Fourth, then coming through city-owned property. The city owns three
82 parcels to facilitate the trail connection, though the steep slopes will require switchbacks.

83 • Ryan emphasized that developing a sidewalk along the west side of Edge Hill Drive will
84 promote pedestrian traffic to access the trail. This sidewalk would be the developer's
85 responsibility for their frontage, as the city fills in trail gaps through development as properties
86 come forward.

87 • Skarlet went through the city code as a checklist, noting several items needing attention:

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

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

127 **Vote:**

128 **Yea- Bob Perry, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.**

129 **Nay- John Petersen**

130 **Abstained-**

131 **Motion passed, item continued.**

133
 134 **Study Items(s):**
 135

136 **46 MIN. 30 SEC.**

137 ➤ **Item No. 3 PCC 10-8-10 Affordable Housing Incentives code addition:** The Planning Commission
 138 will discuss, review and may move forward with setting a public hearing regarding PCC 10-8-10
 139 Affordable Housing Incentives. **(CODE REVIEW)**

140
 141 • The Planning Commission discussed proposed code amendments for affordable housing incentives.
 142 Skarlet presented the draft ordinance, explaining that one of the things that the state is really
 143 encouraging is that cities put some type of incentive program in that ordinance to help incentivize
 144 developers or home builders to be comfortable with entering into moderate income housing and
 145 creating product that would be attainable housing.

146
 147 • She emphasized two key state priorities creating moderate income housing and promoting home
 148 ownership, noting the other thing that's very important to the governor particularly, but it's also in
 149 the state legislature is home ownership.
 150 • Skarlet researched several cities' approaches and developed a proposal based on Providence's general
 151 plan and affordable housing plan.
 152 • The intent of this code is to support the overall goal of the moderate-income housing element of the
 153 general plan by promoting development that provides attractively designed and constructed housing
 154 that increases the availability of housing, promotes affordable housing, promotes home ownership,
 155 and promotes conservation of resources such as water through efficient land use.

156 • **Density Incentive Requirements:**

157 ○ Minimum 20% of proposed units must meet moderate income housing requirements
 158 ○ Moderate income housing is defined as housing for households with gross income no more
 159 than 80% of Cache County's median gross income
 160 ○ A deed restriction would be required for at least 5 years ensuring units continue to meet
 161 moderate income thresholds

162 • When asked about current income levels, Skarlet indicated the 80% mark is around \$63,000, though
 163 Bob Perry noted the general plan report shows \$73,000 as median income. Skarlet also shared that
 164 she had heard on a podcast that "in Utah, homes are 6 times the income level of people in Utah.
 165 Instead of just 3 times, they're 6 times."

166 • **Development Standards for Incentive Projects:**

167 ○ 20% density increase allowed for qualifying developments
 168 ○ Lots for moderate income units can be no less than 80% of base lot size
 169 ○ Front, side street, and rear setbacks must meet base minimums
 170 ○ Interior side yards must be no less than 80% of base setback or 5 feet, whichever is more
 171 ○ Twin homes may have one 0-foot interior side setback

172 • **Zone-Specific Provisions:**

173 ○ Planned Unit Developments: Could receive an additional 15% density bonus (25% total) if
 174 they include moderate income housing
 175 ○ Life Cycle Residential: Maximum density could increase to 15 units per net acre
 176 ○ Mixed Use District: Horizontal development could increase to 30 units per acre; vertical
 177 development to 40 units per acre

177

- 178 The proposal included provisions for creating home ownership promotion zones of 10 contiguous
- 179 acres or less, following Utah Code. Joe Chambers compared this to redevelopment areas where the
- 180 county and the school districts have foregone their portion of the increase to go back into Logan
- 181 City's development to make improvements within that district. Skarlet confirmed it operates on
- 182 similar principles but with different numbers than traditional RDAs.
- 183
- 184
- 185
- 186
- 187
- 188
- 189
- 190
- 191
- 192
- 193
- 194
- 195
- 196
- 197
- 198
- 199
- 200
- 201
- 202
- 203
- 204
- 205
- 206
- 207
- 208
- 209
- 210
- 211
- 212
- 213

- 200
- 201
- 202
- 203
- 204
- 205
- 206
- 207
- 208
- 209
- 210
- 211
- 212
- 213

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.