

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2 Wednesday, January 14th, 2026, 6:00 pm

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

4

5 **Call to Order:** Robert Henke

6 **Chair Roll Call of Members:** Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.

7 **Members Absent:** Michael Fortune.

8 **Staff in Attendance:** City Manager Ryan Snow, City Recorder Ty Cameron and Community Development
9 Director Skarlet Bankhead (remotely).

10 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Robert Henke

11

12 ➤ **Item No. 1 Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes
13 of December 10th, 2025. ([**MINUTES**](#))

14

15 • Chair Henke called for the approval of the minutes of December 10th, 2025.
16 • No issues or corrections were addressed or made.

17

18 **Motion to approve the minutes of December 10th, 2025.- John Petersen. 2nd- Bob Perry.**

19 **Vote:**

20 **Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

21 **Nay-**

22 **Abstained-**

23

24 **Motion passes, minutes approved.**

25

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

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

30

31 • Chair Henke opened the floor for general public comments.
32 • No comments were made. Staff indicated no comments had come in via text or email for general
33 comment.
34 • Chair Henke closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

35

36 **Public Hearings:**

37

38 ➤ **Item No. 2 PCC 10-8-10 Affordable Housing Incentives code addition:** The Planning Commission
39 will take comments and questions from the public regarding PCC addition 10-8-10 Affordable Housing
40 Incentives.

41

42 • Chair Henke called and introduced item 2 and opened the public hearing.
43 • No comments were made. Staff indicated that no comments had come in via text or email
44 regarding this item.

45

46 **Motion to close the public hearing regarding item number 2. – Joe Chambers. 2nd- Julie Martin.**

47 **Vote:**

48 **Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

49 **Nay-**

50 **Abstained-**

52 **Motion passes, public hearing closed.**

53 **Legislative – Action Item(s):**

54 ➤ **Item No. 3 PCC 10-8-10 Affordable Housing Incentives code addition:** The Planning
55 Commission will discuss, review and may make a recommendation to city council regarding PCC
56 addition 10-8-10 Affordable Housing Incentives. **(CODE REVIEW)**

57 • Chair Henke called and introduced item 3.

58 **Joe Chambers motioned to move item towards the end of the agenda so that those present for
59 their items could be heard first. Motioned seconded by Julie Martin. Vote was unanimous.**

60 • Returning to the previously tabled item, the Commission discussed the affordable housing
61 incentives code addition. Chair Henke recalled that rental housing incentives had been discussed
62 at the previous meeting. Skarlet confirmed that the current proposal focuses on home ownership
63 as promoted by the governor's office, but that she had asked Colton Love, a city staff member, to
64 inquire about rental incentives at that morning's Cache County Partners Association meeting.
65 • Skarlet offered two options: proceed with the current home ownership-focused ordinance and
66 address rental incentives later, or wait until rental provisions could be incorporated. She assured
67 the Commission she would continue researching rental incentives regardless of their decision.
68 • Joe Chambers questioned whether there was any legislative deadline pressure. Skarlet indicated
69 there was no immediate rush, noting that demonstrating progress on the issue would satisfy
70 requirements and acknowledging that legislation might change during the current session.
71 • Commission members discussed the merits of waiting for a complete document versus
72 proceeding in stages. Joe Chambers pointed out that waiting would avoid requiring an additional
73 public hearing for rental provisions if they moved forward now. Staff noted that significant
74 changes might necessitate a new public hearing regardless, though the evening's public hearing
75 had required minimal effort.
76 • The consensus emerged that waiting for a complete document incorporating both ownership and
77 rental incentives would be more efficient.

78 **Bob Perry moved to postpone action on the affordable housing incentives code addition until more
79 complete information including rental provisions could be incorporated. Julie Martin seconded
80 the motion.**

81 **Vote:**

82 **Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

83 **Nay-**

84 **Abstained-**

89 **Motion passes, item tabled.**

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

91
92 ➤ **Item No. 4 Preliminary Plat South Edgehill Subdivision (Follow-Up):** The Providence City
93 Planning Commission will review, discuss and may approve a preliminary plat for the South Edgehill
94 Subdivision.

95
96 • Chair Henke called and introduced item 4. It was noted that an audience member present tonight
97 had comments regarding the plat.
98 • Ben Maughan of 540 Edge Hill Drive in Providence came forward to present four specific
99 concerns he had submitted in writing regarding the South Edgehill Subdivision preliminary plat.
100 • Ben Maughan's first concern addressed the Logan City Fire Department's driveway slope
101 requirements. He observed that the existing driveway appeared significantly steeper than other
102 lots in the area, estimating approximately an 8 percent grade. He noted that while the fire
103 department listed slope requirements in their review, no verification had been conducted. Ben
104 Maughan expressed concern about whether the steep grade would comply with code
105 requirements.
106 • His second issue involved property line discrepancies on the north side, where two different
107 property lines were shown on the plans. Ben pointed out that the existing fence line was not
108 depicted on the map, making it difficult to determine accurate boundaries. He suggested that
109 either the property owner or city representatives should contact the Thompson family, who
110 owned the adjacent property, to prevent future boundary disputes. This concern related to a lot
111 where an additional house was being proposed in front of an existing structure.
112 • Ben Maughan's third comment addressed the Spring Creek Water Company's lateral servicing
113 the property. He questioned whether the irrigation lateral was shown in the correct location on
114 the plans or if it was missing entirely. As a water user of the same company, Ben was curious
115 whether the subdivision would utilize this lateral and emphasized the importance of proper
116 disclosure and coordination with the irrigation company.
117 • His fourth concern involved the dedication requirements for Canyon Road (100 East). Ben
118 identified discrepancies in the documentation, noting that while some references mentioned a 66-
119 foot right-of-way, the road was classified as a major collector, which typically requires a
120 different footprint.
121 • Skarlet responded remotely, explaining that detailed grading requirements, including driveway
122 slopes, would be addressed during the final plat phase when construction drawings are
123 submitted. She emphasized that at the preliminary plat stage, such specific details are not yet
124 available but confirmed that any development must meet fire department requirements.
125 • Ryan Snow noted that typically the Commission doesn't discuss items without representation
126 from the developer present. Tom Neal, the developer, was not in attendance. Skarlet supported
127 postponing discussion, offering to follow up with Neal the next day regarding the grading plan
128 and driveway concerns.
129 • Commission members agreed that having the developer present would be beneficial to address
130 the raised concerns directly and allow for proper responses.

131 **Motion to table item 4 until applicant can be present. – Bob Perry. 2nd- Julie Martin.**

132 **Vote:**

133 **Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**
134

135 **Nay-**

136 **Abstained-**

137 **Motion passes, item tabled.**

139 ➤ **Item No. 5 Hoth Preliminary Plat (Additional Townhomes):** The Planning Commission will
140 review, discuss and may take action on a preliminary plat for the Hoth additional townhomes project.
141 This project is located on parcel 02-092-0046 in the general are of 430 N 100 W, Providence UT.

142 **(PLANS & DRAWINGS)**

144

- 145 • Chair Henke called and introduced item 5 and asked the applicant to present on their project.
- 146 • Lance Anderson came forward representing what he requested be called the "Parkway" project
147 rather than "Hoth" as listed. The project involves adding a duplex with attached garage to an
148 existing four-plex on Spring Creek Parkway. Mr. Anderson presented plans showing the new
149 units would be constructed to the east of the existing townhomes, connecting to the existing
150 parking lot, with the remainder of the eastern portion to be landscaped.
- 151 • The primary discussion point centered on a staff comment requiring the relocation of the existing
152 sidewalk to include a seven-foot park strip. Ryan Snow explained that current city standards
153 require new development to include park strips for snow storage and pedestrian safety. The
154 existing sidewalk sits immediately adjacent to the curb with no separation.
- 155 • Mr. Anderson expressed concern that relocating the sidewalk would place it on private property
156 since the right-of-way doesn't accommodate both the sidewalk and required park strip. He also
157 noted that the existing sidewalk configuration continues along the entire road up to the church,
158 and questioned the practicality of changing just this section.
- 159 • Ryan Snow clarified that park strips serve important functions for snow storage and create safer
160 pedestrian environments. He explained the difference between dedicating right-of-way (city
161 ownership) versus granting an easement (city access while property owner retains ownership).
162 Mr. Anderson indicated willingness to find a solution but emphasized the constructability
163 challenges.
- 164 • After viewing the site plan, Commission members and staff agreed on a compromise: the
165 sidewalk would be relocated to include a park strip only in the undeveloped green area where
166 new construction would occur, rather than along the entire property frontage. This approach
167 would address safety concerns while acknowledging the practical constraints of the existing
168 development.
- 169 • Commission members also discussed water table concerns given the proximity to a pond on the
170 south side. Mr. Anderson confirmed the townhomes would be slab-on-grade construction
without basements, addressing any potential water table issues.

171 **Motion to approve the preliminary plat for parcel 02-092-0046 with the condition that an**
172 **easement be granted to the city for placement of a park strip in the undeveloped area, subject to**
173 **the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions set forth in the staff report. – Julie Martin.**
174 **2nd- Joe Chambers.**

175 **Vote:**

176 **Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

177 **Nay-**

178 **Abstained-**

179 **Motion passes, item approved with conditions.**

180 **Study Items(s):**

181 ➤ **Item No. 6 Lot 7 Providence City Center Subdivision Rezone Request:** The Planning
182 Commission will review discuss and may move forward with setting a public hearing regarding a
183 request to rezone parcel 02-336-0002, located in the general area of 48 S Hwy 165, from CHD
184 (Commercial Hwy) to CGD (Commercial General). **(REZONE ANALYSIS)**

185

- 186 • Chair Henke called and introduced item 6 and asked the applicant to present on their rezone
187 request.
- 188 • Kendall Hawkins, a resident of Orem and Utah State University alumnus, presented a request to
189 rezone parcel 02-336-0002 from Commercial Highway District (CHD) to Commercial General
190 District (CGD). The parcel is located behind the new Chick-fil-A restaurant, east of the
191 development.
- 192 • Mr. Hawkins explained that the arrival of Chick-fil-A, while generating substantial sales tax
193 revenue for the city, had fundamentally changed the development potential of the surrounding
194 parcels. The restaurant's placement eliminated front parking that would typically support
195 traditional retail development. Given these constraints, the property owner proposed constructing
196 a 30,000-square-foot flex building instead of traditional retail.
- 197 • Mr. Hawkins described flex buildings as versatile commercial structures typically 20-24 feet in
198 height that can accommodate various uses including offices, service businesses, and
199 membership-based operations like gymnastics facilities or entertainment venues. He emphasized
200 that many potential tenants would still generate sales tax revenue, though the CGD zoning
201 wouldn't mandate the 88% sales tax-generating requirement of the current CHD zoning.
- 202 • Skarlet provided context via phone, explaining the key distinction between the zones: CHD
203 requires approximately 88% of gross floor space to be sales tax-producing businesses, while
204 CGD allows 100% office or professional use without sales tax generation requirements. She
205 noted that while the site currently has visibility from Gateway Drive, future development of the
206 mixed-use area could reduce this visibility.
- 207 • Ryan Snow posed the critical question of what benefit the city would gain from the rezone. He
208 acknowledged that while the city would give up guaranteed sales tax potential, it would gain
209 development flexibility and property tax revenue that would exceed that of a parking lot. He
210 emphasized the need to weigh whether holding out for sales tax-generating development was
211 realistic given the site constraints.
- 212 • Commission members expressed interest in learning more about flex buildings and their typical
213 uses. Hawkins provided a conceptual site plan showing parking surrounding the building with
214 access connections to adjacent properties. He confirmed that parking requirements would be
215 similar whether the building housed retail or flex uses, with most uses requiring one space per
216 200-250 square feet.
- 217 • When asked about the wetlands shown on the plan, Mr. Hawkins confirmed these would remain
218 undisturbed. Bob Perry inquired about building height, and Mr. Hawkins confirmed it would be a
219 single-story structure, though some tenants might build interior mezzanines.

221

222

223

- Commission members agreed that a public hearing would be appropriate to gather public input on the proposed rezone. Joe Chambers suggested that Mr. Hawkins bring images of similar flex buildings to help the public and Commission better understand the proposed development.

224 **Motion to schedule a public hearing for the February 11th Planning Commission meeting**
225 **regarding the rezone request. – Joe Chambers. 2nd- Bob Perry.**

226 **Vote:**

227 **Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

228 **Nay-**

229 **Abstained-**

230 **Motion passes, item to be set for public hearing.**

231 ➤ **Item No. 7 OPMA Training:** The Planning Commission will watch and review the OPMA training
232 from the Utah Office of the State Auditor per the annual state requirement. [**\(VIDEO\)**](#) & [**\(KEY**](#)
233 [**SUMMARIES HANDOUT\)**](#)

234

235

- The Commission concluded the meeting with the required annual Open and Public Meetings Act (OPMA) training video from the Utah Office of the State Auditor.

236 **Bob Perry moved to close the meeting. Julie Martin seconded the motion.**

237 **Vote:**

238 **Yea- Bob Perry, John Petersen, Robert Henke, Julie Martin & Joe Chambers.**

239 **Nay-**

240 **Abstained-**

241 **Motion passes, meeting adjourned.**

242 **Minutes approved by vote of Commission on 11th day of February 2026.**

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

244



245 **Ty Cameron, City Recorder**