PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Wednesday, May 13th, 2026, 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 item is the timestamp of the YouTube recording.

Call to Order: Robert Henke
Chair Roll Call of Commission Members: Bob Perry, Michael Fortune, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.
Planning Members Absent: Julie Martin and John Petersen.
Staff in Attendance: City Manager Ryan Snow, Community Development Director Skarlet Bankhead and City Recorder Ty Cameron.
Pledge of Allegiance: Bob Perry

- **Item No. 1 Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes of April 8th, 2026. **(MINUTES)**

  - Chair Henke called for the approval of the minutes of April 8th, 2026.
  - No corrections or changes were made or requested.

  Motion to approve the minutes of April 8th, 2026. – Bob Perry. 2nd- Michael Fortune.
  Vote:
  Yea- Bob Perry, Michael Fortune, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.
  Nay-
  Abstained-

  Motion passes, 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 general public comment.
- Staff indicated that all emailed comments that had come in were in regards to item 2. Noted that they were forwarded to the Planning Commission as they came in and would be attached to the minutes for this meeting.
- No comments were made.
- Chair Henke closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Public Hearings:

- **Item No. 2 Parcel 02-095-0031 Rezone Public Hearing:** The Planning Commission will take comments and questions from the public regarding a request to rezone Parcel 02-095-0031, located in

the general area of 96 N Main. The property is currently zoned R-1-12; the applicant is requesting Mixed Use (MXD).

- Chair Henke opened the public hearing for the proposed rezone of Parcel 02-095-0031, located at approximately 96 North Main Street, from R-1-12 (single-family residential, minimum 12,000 sq. ft. lot) to Mixed Use (MXD). He noted that the Planning Commission's role in this process is solely to make a recommendation to the City Council, which holds final decision-making authority. He advised the public that speakers would be given five minutes each, and requested that comments avoid repeating points already made by others to allow more participants an opportunity to speak.

Staff Presentation — Community Development Director Skarlet Bankhead

- Director Bankhead presented the staff analysis to the Commission. She explained the key distinctions between the two zones under consideration. The current R-1-12 district is established for single-family residential use with limited home business allowances. The requested Mixed Use (MXD) district is intended to encourage transitions between zones and stimulate economic development by combining retail, commercial, office, and residential uses in a pedestrian- and family-friendly manner. Critically, the MXD zone requires that no single land use exceed 50% of the entire development, and residential use is mandatory.
- Director Bankhead noted that the property is located within the Providence Historic District, which is on the National Historic Register. However, she clarified that this designation does not establish a separate zoning district. Within the historic district, zoning is currently divided among R-1-12, Commercial General, and Public districts, and permitted uses and area regulations are governed by the applicable zoning district regardless of the historic district designation. She further clarified that the Historic Preservation Commission's binding review authority applies only to properties listed on a locally designated sites register. The subject property at 96 North Main is not on the locally designated register, nor is it included in the city's historic walking tour. Providence has only two structures on the National Historic Register: the Old Rock Church and the Zollinger home at 193 North, 100 East.
- Director Bankhead read the applicant's project statement into the record, which described the intent to develop a pedestrian-friendly, historically inspired commercial and residential development consistent with a downtown main street aesthetic. The applicant's stated goals include curated local businesses on the ground floor, affordable two-bedroom apartments on the upper level, rear parking, outdoor dining, and exterior amenities encouraging multimodal transportation.
- Director Bankhead walked the Commission through the Providence City General Plan's framework map, which designates the area around 96 North Main as the "Providence Downtown Core" — a preferred scenario calling for a downtown main street style of commercial and office uses arranged either horizontally or vertically. She noted comparable examples including downtown Provo, Ogden's 25th Street, downtown Murray, and the historic character of downtown Logan.
- She addressed the moderate income housing requirements under state law, noting that while recent legislative changes have simplified the annual reporting obligation, Providence is still expected to continue working toward the goals of the moderate income housing plan, including providing varied housing opportunities. Director Bankhead also clarified the state law framework under Utah Code 10-25-01, affirming the Planning Commission's role as a

recommending body to the legislative (City Council) body. She noted that not all development details — including parking calculations, utility master plan compliance, and site design specifics — need to be resolved at the rezone stage; those matters are addressed in subsequent site plan and subdivision review steps. She also advised the Commission that they were not required to make a recommendation that evening, and could continue the item for further study.

Applicant Presentation

- The applicant, Jody Robins, presented an updated version of the project to the Commission. He described the genesis of the project as a personal desire to create a walkable, charming, pedestrian-scale commercial destination within the Providence community. The concept centers on six flexible commercial spaces on the ground floor — targeting local community businesses such as a café, bakery, floral shop, boutique, ice cream, and soda shop — with six two-bedroom, two-bathroom apartments on the second level. The development also includes two outdoor dining areas, sidewalk-adjacent seating, and bike parking.
- Mr. Robins described the architectural intent as historically inspired, referencing the classic brickwork of surrounding properties and aiming for a building that would appear contemporaneous with the Old Rock Church. He stated the buildings would be approximately 26 feet in height (with taller decorative facades), set back 25 feet from neighboring property lines, and include a 10-foot landscape buffer for neighbor privacy. He compared this favorably to what current R-1-12 zoning already permits, which would allow a 35-foot structure set as close as 10 feet from the property line.
- Mr. Robins addressed the general plan's six key initiatives, highlighting sense of place, the multimodal city vision, and varied housing opportunities as the three most directly served by the proposal. He acknowledged the site's historical significance as a former tithing storehouse that served as a community gathering place, and committed to reusing architectural materials and details from the existing structure and installing a commemorative plaque. He directed the public to the project website at refinedcommunities.com for additional information.

Public Comments

- The public hearing proceeded with a sign-in list, with speakers given up to five minutes. The following individuals Commented:
- Karen Brooks, a lifelong Providence resident and member of the Historic Preservation Commission, raised concerns about parking adequacy, noting she had been previously informed there would be 15 parking spaces, which she characterized as insufficient for six businesses and six apartments on a high-traffic street. She also raised concerns about the proximity to a school and the impact of increased traffic on pedestrian safety, particularly for children.
- Jeanette Christenson a 48-year resident of Providence, questioned the community desire for a development modeled after downtown Ogden or Provo. She acknowledged the building design but expressed concern about the rezoning of property within the historic district that is currently designated single-family residential in the city's master plan. She raised questions about the volunteer effort that went into creating the historic district and the general plan, and whether a rezone would undermine that work. She cited traffic safety for school-age children, questioned whether 15 parking spaces could adequately serve the development, and noted that as an apartment owner she would typically expect 3 vehicles per two-bedroom unit. She also raised the concern that once rezoned to mixed use, the property must legally accommodate any

commercial entity permitted within Providence City limits, not just the curated businesses envisioned by the developer. She expressed concern about the precedent a rezone would set for future residential rezoning requests, and argued there is no shortage of available rental housing in the area.

- Patricia Perry, a resident living across from the tithing house, expressed agreement with the prior speaker's comments and concern about traffic, specifically noting that 100 North has become difficult to cross safely as a pedestrian. She yielded the remainder of her time.
- Joe Bates, a resident living across from the Old Rock Church, offered a historical perspective on the difficulty of sustaining businesses at the corner of Main and Center. He recounted multiple failed business ventures in the immediate vicinity over the decades, including the building across the street from the Old Rock Church which he described as in partial disrepair, a former automotive business that had declined in character, and a long-vacant commercial building that could not attract tenants. He argued the intersection of 100 North and Main is not a destination that draws the kind of foot traffic needed to sustain the proposed businesses, and suggested the area around Macy's would be better suited. He expressed concern that the building is too tall, lacks adequate parking, and noted that businesses near a school would not be eligible for a liquor license, limiting the types of restaurants that could succeed there. He urged the Commission to deny the application.
- Roxanne, a Providence resident who spent time living in Los Angeles and other large cities, stated she did not want urban development patterns brought into what she characterized as a bedroom community. She acknowledged that change can be good but argued the subject location is sensitive due to pedestrian activity and children and suggested the area near the city offices would be a better fit for this type of development given its greater capacity for parking and community activity.
- Jean Briel a resident who walks in the area regularly, agreed with the suggestion that development of this type would be better suited near the city office building, noting that the post office and city offices had already relocated away from the historic downtown. She raised concerns about inconsistent application of city rules and echoed the suggestion to locate commercial development where more people already walk.
- Don Briel expressed concern about the broader precedent of spot zoning a single lot in the middle of a single-family residential area, and noted that while change is inevitable, there is ample space elsewhere in the city to accommodate it. He echoed his wife's comments about the unsuitability of the area as a walking destination, noting sidewalk deficiencies, summer heat, and winter conditions.
- Ruth Bindrup expressed support for the project. She acknowledged the concerns raised about the existing home on the property but characterized it as neglected and in need of significant investment to restore. She expressed confidence in the developer's quality of work based on her own experience living in a home he had built, and requested that the Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.
- Alan Clutter identified himself as a strong proponent of mixed use development and higher-density housing in principle but stated he could not be more opposed to this specific application. He argued that one block south, at Main and Center, there are already two commercially zoned properties that have been for sale for years, are struggling to retain tenants, are in need of renovation, and have dedicated parking — making them far more appropriate candidates for mixed use revitalization before a historic rental property is demolished. He objected to the unnecessary loss of the existing structure, raised the issue of a blind corner being created by placing a building close to the sidewalk at a dangerous intersection, noted that

neighbors to the east would lose long-established mountain views, and argued that historic relevance cannot be recreated through a building designed to look old.

- Craig Frank testified that he grew up next door to the tithing house and had lived in Providence for approximately 64 years. He stated that Providence's downtown had never had the kind of Hallmark-style commercial storefronts the developer was envisioning, and he described the current intersection as genuinely dangerous due to vehicle speeds and the diagonal parking on the east side of Main Street. He suggested that redevelopment of the old Watkins Printing building might be a better alternative and raised the possibility of looking at commercial development on the periphery of the community rather than in the historic residential core.
- Lacey Boschetto, a 33-year resident who had also lived in California, said that in her experience, once a rezone occurs, it tends to continue expanding and communities are not able to reclaim what was lost. She questioned what commercial development would come next to connect the proposed site with existing commercial properties, and echoed concerns that the site is not appropriate for this type of use. She noted she had also submitted a detailed email.
- Natalie, an entrepreneur of five years and Providence resident, spoke about the importance of evaluating whether the benefit of any change outweighs its costs. She concluded that the proposed benefits — a gathering space, food and treats, and housing — are already provided elsewhere in the community through parks, existing restaurants, and stores. She raised concerns about what would happen if unwanted businesses moved in once the property is rezoned, and whether commercial development at this location would create pressure on neighboring residential properties over time. She expressed support for exploring redevelopment one block south or at another location.
- Frank, who described himself as an 80-year Providence resident and likely the oldest person in the room, said he had witnessed many old homes demolished and replaced with new ones in his lifetime. Based on what he had heard, he summarized the consensus of the room as opposition to the proposed development at this location.
- Robert, a neighboring resident living kitty-corner across the street, described his experience in the food service industry and expressed skepticism that independent local businesses could sustain the rent burden of the proposed commercial spaces. He raised the concern that if the boutique businesses envisioned by the developer could not survive financially, the spaces could eventually be filled by businesses not in keeping with the neighborhood character.
- Mark Frank expressed doubt that residents would travel to a boutique commercial district only minutes from downtown Logan, and questioned whether the location — where traffic is primarily composed of commuters heading to and from the bench neighborhoods — could sustain enough foot traffic to make businesses viable. He contrasted the proposal unfavorably with areas closer to existing residential density.
- John Drew, a former mayor of Providence and former Planning Commissioner, offered an extended perspective on the city's history. He noted that Providence is unique among Cache Valley cities in having abandoned its historic downtown by relocating city offices to the edge of town, a decision he had opposed at the time. He expressed support for revitalizing the downtown area and noted that the property in question is not well maintained. He shared his background co-chairing a regional housing crisis task force and acknowledged the reality of population growth in Cache County, noting that traffic will increase regardless of whether this particular rezone occurs. He raised the question of whether the Historic Preservation Commission had been formally consulted and recommended that the Planning Commission consider seeking more input before making a recommendation rather than acting immediately.

He characterized the developer's efforts as made in good faith and consistent with the general plan, while acknowledging the future land use map is a recommendation and not a mandate.

- Benjamin Chandler, a 26-year-old resident, spoke in favor of the rezone. He described the difficulty young people and young families face in finding affordable housing within Providence and questioned where the Commission would suggest those families live if not in a development like this one.
- Roger Roundy acknowledged the economic rationale for developing the subject corner rather than the block to the south, as the acquisition cost is lower. He disclosed that his family has made an offer to purchase the property from its current owner and has been in contact with the developer, with the goal of preserving the historical character of the site without requiring a mixed-use rezone. He noted that Craig Frank and Mark Frank are his brothers-in-law and that his family's in-laws live adjacent to the south. He expressed the view that the community does not support the rezone and that a mixed-use designation would raise questions about the long-term fate of the other residential lots between the proposed development and the existing commercial properties to the south. He indicated his family's intent to submit a formal proposal to the landowner and developer.
- Chair Henke closed the public hearing

Legislative – Action Item(s):

- **Item No. 3 Parcel 02-095-0031 Rezone Recommendation:** The Planning Commission will review, discuss and may make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the application to rezone Parcel 02-095-0031 from R-1-12 to Mixed Use. **(PRESENTATION)** & **(ANALYSIS)**

- Chair Henke opened the discussion portion of the item. Director Bankhead clarified, in response to a question from Commissioner Chambers, that while spot zoning is no longer legally prohibited under state code — which now allows zoning districts of any size and shape — it remains a legitimate planning consideration for the Commission when evaluating compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. Director Bankhead affirmed that mixed use is a recognized zone in the general plan's downtown core designation.
- Commissioner Fortune offered an extended discussion of the comments received. He noted that the applicant had gone significantly beyond what is required at the rezone stage in providing detailed plans and presentations, and he appreciated that transparency. He outlined several concerns raised during public testimony that he considered valid:
    - The proposed development may be somewhat out of scale relative to the existing neighborhood context, particularly given the buildings' proximity to the sidewalk and the visual impact of the second-story elements and overhangs compared to surrounding residential structures. Commissioner Fortune noted that in a residential context, setbacks and landscaping buffer the mass of a structure, while the proposed design places the building much closer to the street.
    - Parking adequacy was raised repeatedly. Commissioner Fortune noted that six two-bedroom apartments could reasonably generate 12 or more vehicles, and six commercial spaces would require additional parking for employees and customers before any customer parking is accounted for. He acknowledged that the MXD zone permits some street-side parking to count toward commercial requirements, and that this calculation does not need to be resolved at the rezone stage.

    - Traffic at the intersection of 100 North and Main was identified as a significant and valid community concern. Commissioner Fortune noted that the intersection is already considered dangerous and that additional commercial traffic would likely exacerbate conditions.
- Commissioner Fortune acknowledged the question of business longevity, noting that the existing commercial properties one block south have struggled to maintain tenants, and raised the question of what uses might occupy the spaces if the curated tenant mix envisioned by the developer cannot be sustained.
- He also addressed the Tithing house, confirming it is not on the locally designated historic register and that the historic portion of the structure — the original brick section — is a small 15-by-22-foot interior space with no plumbing, the remainder of the building consisting of later aluminum-siding additions. He suggested that, if there is community interest in preserving the historic section, it could potentially be relocated to another site, as has been done with historic cabins in other Utah communities, and noted that the applicant had offered to facilitate that.
- The applicant responded to Commissioner Fortune's observations. On the parking question, he clarified that the site plan includes 26 on-site spaces plus 9 street-side spaces bordering the parcel, and that one of the building's ground-floor footprints incorporates three two-car garages to provide additional parking while reducing commercial square footage to achieve code compliance. On the traffic concern, he noted that pedestrian-scale, built-out environments naturally tend to reduce vehicle speeds compared to open corridors, and that restoration of a four-way stop at the intersection — which was previously in place — could be an appropriate first step if traffic volumes increase. On the question of building scale, he maintained that the footprints of the proposed buildings are comparable to a standard three-car-garage residential home and that the rendering perspective may make the buildings appear larger than they are. On commercial viability, he noted that the comparable businesses he cited — including examples in Logan and nearby areas — are among the few businesses in the valley with successful outdoor dining, and he attributed their success in part to their location away from high-speed arterials.
- Chair Henke then engaged Director Bankhead on the question of how the general plan's downtown core designation interacts with the current residential zoning of the parcel, and how a single-parcel rezone squares with the concept of spot zoning. Director Bankhead reiterated that the general plan framework map identifies the area as a preferred downtown core location and that mixed use is a recognized zone under that designation, even if the underlying parcel is currently zoned R-1-12.
- Commissioner Bob Perry provided data he had personally collected by counting vehicle traffic at the park entrance on 100 North during ballgames on the preceding Monday and Tuesday evenings. He recorded over 400 vehicles per hour during peak game hours on both nights, with additional horn-honking incidents resulting from drivers backing out of diagonal parking spaces into moving traffic. He also reported having been nearly struck twice in the crosswalk at Main and First North, with the same vehicle later making even closer contact with another pedestrian. Commissioner Perry stated this data underscored the community's traffic safety concerns.
- Commissioner Chambers expressed a desire to research what commercial uses would be permitted under MXD zoning as a matter of right before making a recommendation, noting his concern about the potential for commercial uses inconsistent with the neighborhood character.

Motion to continue Item No. 3 to the next regular Planning Commission meeting was made by Commissioner Bob Perry and seconded by Commissioner Michael Fortune.
Vote:

Yea- Bob Perry, Michael Fortune, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.
Nay-
Abstained-

Motion passes, Item Continued.

- Chair Henke advised those in attendance that the Commission meets on the second Wednesday of each month, and that the item would most likely appear on the June 2026 agenda. Members of the public were invited to attend.

Study Items(s):

- **Item No. 4 PCC 10-12-3&4 Code Amendments:** The Planning Commission will review, discuss and may move forward with setting a public hearing regarding proposed code amendments to extend the sunset day for the incentive to record the deed restriction for an IADU or an ADU. **(AMENDMENT)**

  - Director Bankhead presented a brief overview of the proposed code amendment. She explained that Providence City Code sections 10-12-3 and 10-12-4 currently contain an incentive provision encouraging property owners with internal accessory dwelling units (IADUs) or detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) to voluntarily record a deed restriction at the county confirming that one of the units on the property must be owner-occupied. This owner-occupancy requirement is a condition of ADU approval, and the deed restriction is the mechanism by which the city gains awareness of and can track ADU activity, particularly for internal units which are otherwise not easily identifiable without a permit application.
  - Director Bankhead reported that the sunset date for this incentive provision was imminent — within days — and that staff was requesting a two-year extension. She noted that the program had proven meaningfully successful, with approximately six property owners having participated since the incentive was introduced, representing roughly six times the rate of voluntary compliance seen prior to the incentive. A staff member added that the incentive has clearly driven increased participation and that extending it is warranted given that positive trend.
  - Commissioners discussed the program briefly. Commissioner Perry asked whether there were concerns about ADUs being used for purposes other than housing, such as short-term rentals. Director Bankhead indicated no formal complaints had been received regarding misuse of ADUs, and that short-term rental use is not the intended purpose of the units. She noted that parking-related complaints occur across the city generally and are not specific to ADU properties.
  - A former Planning Commissioner in attendance, Brian Marble, offered a comment suggesting that the incentive amount could be increased — for example, from $100 to $1,000 — to further encourage participation. Chair Henke noted that Mr. Marble would have an opportunity to raise that suggestion formally at the public hearing.
  - The Commission agreed to proceed with scheduling a public hearing on the proposed code amendment.

Motion to set a public hearing regarding proposed code amendments to PCC 10-12-3 and 10-12-4 to extend the sunset date for the deed restriction incentive for IADUs and ADUs was made by Commissioner Joe Chambers and seconded by Commissioner Michael Fortune.

Vote:
Yea- Bob Perry, Michael Fortune, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.
Nay-
Abstained-

Motion passes, item to be set for public hearing.

- Before adjourning, City Manager Ryan Snow noted for the record that the city has repaired over 7,000 trip hazards in recent years and has specifically focused on replacing sidewalk sections in the downtown area to improve walkability, in response to comments made during the public hearing. Commissioner Fortune acknowledged the significance of those efforts.

Motion to adjourn the meeting. – Commissioner Michael Fortune. 2nd- Commissioner Robert Henke.
Vote:
Yea- Bob Perry, Michael Fortune, Robert Henke & Joe Chambers.
Nay-
Abstained-

Motion passes, meeting adjourned.

Minutes approved by vote of Commission on 10th day of June 2026.

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

Ty Cameron, City Recorder

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Providence Town Square

Mandy E. Olsen <[redacted]>
To: "providencecityutah@gmail.com" <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Wed, May 6, 2026 at 8:00 AM

Dear Members of the Providence City Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed town square development currently under consideration. I appreciate the Commission's role in shaping the future of our community, and I ask that you carefully reconsider this project in light of several important concerns.

First, I am worried about the potential impact on traffic and infrastructure. The proposed development appears likely to increase congestion in an area that is already strained with school and baseball traffic, creating safety risks and reducing quality of life for nearby residents. It is not clear that existing roads and public services can adequately support this level of growth.

Second, the character of the community will be significantly altered. Providence has a unique identity, and developments of this scale risk undermining the small-town feel and sense of place that many residents value. Growth should be thoughtful and aligned with the long-term vision of the community and not simply for the sake of growth.

Finally, I encourage the Commission to ensure community voices are fully heard. Many residents may feel that developments like this move forward without sufficient public input or transparency. Taking the time to engage meaningfully with the community will lead to better outcomes for everyone.

I respectfully urge you to not approve the town square development as currently proposed and to prioritize alternatives that better reflect the needs and values of Providence residents.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mandy E. Olsen
[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Rezone of 96 N. Main St from R-1-12 to Mixed Use

1 message

Joe Bates [redacted]> Wed, May 6, 2026 at 6:02 PM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We are writing in opposition to the rezoning of Parcel # 02-095-0031 for the proposed Providence Town Square development at the Northeast corner of 1st North and Main Street in Providence. Providence is a bedroom community with some commercial development at its western edge. Allowing this development to be built as proposed is a terrible mistake on the City's part.

1. The building is grossly oversized for the neighborhood and incompatible in scale with the surrounding single-family homes which are largely one story with large expanses of open space surrounding them. Many have yards that extend half way through the block. In contrast, this development is designed to use all available space both horizontally and vertically, creating a pastiche of storefronts that will overpower the surrounding homes. It would be more suitable in Disneyworld than in Providence. The height of any building in this area should be limited to one story to be compatible with the neighborhood.

2. Access to off street parking is totally inadequate. There are at most 19 spaces shown in the plan and possibly only 14 spaces. With 9 spaces minimum reserved for the 6 apartments and 6 commercial spaces of approximately 1100 square feet each requiring 5 spaces apiece, the minimum total parking required is 39 spaces. There are additional code requirements for EV parking and charging and bicycle parking with a maintenance and repair station which will further limit parking in back. Since the commercial space employees will most likely occupy the remaining available on-site spaces, this will force most customers and visitors to park on the surrounding streets. Possibly 20 or more vehicles will be added to street parking in the vicinity at any time. In winter, Providence parking rules forbid overnight street parking and discourage it during the day after any snow.

In addition, there is only one entrance/exit to the parking lot. It is on the Northeast corner of the lot. Cars entering from the East will need to turn across traffic to enter and cars leaving will need to do the same to exit to the West. The intersection at 1st East and Main Street is already a dangerous one due to the removal of the stop sign there. This development will only make the traffic flow more dangerous especially for pedestrians and bicyclists.

The parking lot does not seem to have adequate provisions for snow or trash removal as it is narrow with only one entrance/exit and will have vehicles owned by the apartment renters parked there overnight.

3. Main Street at Center Street already has several buildings that could be replaced with a new development without destroying existing housing. Burris Automotive has long been an eyesore with a crumbling building and junk cars surrounding it. Across the street to the East, the Immaculate Homes building has struggled to find tenants. A restaurant (Calloway's) there failed several years ago. The former deteriorating Watkins Printing building on the Southwest corner has land available for development and parking. Why are we talking about approving a new building that is overscale for the area instead of upgrading or replacing existing buildings in the real Providence City Downtown Core first?

4. There is space available in the area surrounding Macey's that would be more suitable for a development seeking pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle traffic and there are also several large apartment complexes in the immediate area. To try to put an oversized building at 1st North and Main Street where the traffic is mostly commuters going to work or home seems destined to fail. The developer has already acknowledged at the last Planning Commission meeting that he will most likely need to subsidize rents to attract commercial tenants to his project. How does this indicate a successful project in the making?

5. The enterprises at Main Street and Center Street are either businesses that close at 5 pm or, in the case of the Old Rock Church have a 9pm cutoff for events. Will the "outdoor dining spaces" and other retail tenants have a similar cutoff time? The surrounding single-family homes would appreciate that.

6. The rezoning and construction of the proposed mega building will negatively affect the property values of the surrounding homes. The home at 76 North Main Street will have the over two-story high back of the proposed building facing its property and without any buffer of trees and other vegetation to mitigate the impact will lose tens of thousands of dollars of property value as will other nearby single-family homes.

In conclusion, there are far more reasons to recommend against this request for rezoning than to approve it. Please vote to disallow the request for rezoning of Parcel # 02-095-0031.

Sincerely,

Joseph and Roxene Bates
19 S. Main St.
Providence, UT 84332
[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Tithing House

1 message

Jana <[redacted]> Wed, May 6, 2026 at 8:10 PM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

I sent this....

I wanted to share my thoughts on the development being discussed next week. I will be out of town, otherwise I would attend in person.
I strongly disagree with tearing down the historic Tithing House in Providence. A building with that much history should be preserved, not demolished. The thought of losing it is heartbreaking.
I also do not believe this location is appropriate for a "downtown" style development. The area is surrounded by residential homes and has never felt like a downtown district. If anything, that type of development would make more sense the roundabout by Maceys, not in the middle of a quiet neighborhood.
Adding apartments and shops on that corner would dramatically increase traffic, parking issues, and congestion in an area that is currently quaint, family-oriented, and peaceful.
Please do not approve this project and risk ruining the character of the neighborhood or losing the beautiful historic Tithing House.

Jana Coburn

"Why is drinking 8 cups of water seem impossible but 8 cups of Diet Mtn Dew goes down like a chubby kid on a seesaw??"

[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Providence Town Square Development

1 message

Sharee Garrett <[redacted]> Thu, May 7, 2026 at 8:03 PM
To: "providencecityutah@gmail.com" <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Good evening,

In regards to the rezoning of parcel #02-095-0031, I would like to express disagreement with rezoning this particular parcel as intended.

This location is too close to the school. Businesses like this will draw even more traffic to this location, posing additional safety concerns for children traveling to and from school each day. Especially with the amount of street parking proposed to access the businesses, further reducing visibility and increasing risk.

Additionally, the cost of building something like this means that the rent for business owners is likely to be unaffordable for a small town like this to be able to sustain...leading to failed businesses, and additional empty buildings remaining vacant along Main street.

I am not opposed to the idea of more business space in Providence, but I think it needs to remain closer to the outskirts of town so that neighboring community patronage will be able to access, support, and grow the businesses housed there with us.

Restaurants especially toward the south end of town would likely be very popular and well-visited. You would have the high school coming to visit them during lunch breaks each day. Students at Ridgeline are currently traveling into Millville and Hyrum to access off-campus lunch options. I would love something closer for them to access and not have to rush due to the added travel time.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed a Providence resident of Main Street,

--
Sharee Garrett

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Concerns With Rezone of Parcel #02-095-0031

1 message

Brent Crosbie <[redacted]> Thu, May 7, 2026 at 9:09 PM
To: ProvidenceCityUtah@gmail.com

TO: PROVIDENCE PLANNING COMMISSION

We are writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed rezoning of Parcel #02-095-0031 from R-1-12 to Multi-Use. Furthermore, we are strongly opposed to the proposed "Providence Town Square Development."

Our primary concerns include:

- The creation of a parking situation that appears to be inconsistent with existing Providence City ordinances
- Incompatibility with the established character and existing homes within the neighborhood
- Increased congestion at an already heavily traveled intersection and its proximity to the school
- Increased noise and activity levels
- Potential negative impacts on surrounding property values
- Additional concerns related to the overall scale and density of the proposed development

We also want to clearly express our growing frustration with outside developers coming into our community and attempting to reshape Providence according to their own vision, rather than respecting the character and wishes of the residents who live here.

Several years ago, a similar mixed-use development was proposed approximately two blocks west of this location. That project ultimately failed due to strong opposition from homeowners in the area. Many residents, including ourselves, chose to build our homes in Providence because of its rural atmosphere, quieter pace, and residential character. We would very much like to see that character preserved.

While this type of development may be appropriate in certain parts of Providence, we firmly believe the currently proposed location is not suitable.

Sincerely,

R Brent and Bonnie Crosbie

72 W Center Street, Providence

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Rezone of parcel 02-095-0031

1 message

J & A Coburn [redacted] Sat, May 9, 2026 at 8:11 AM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

To Providence Planning Commission,

Why is the rezone for the proposed Providence town square development even being considered for this area of Providence? It doesn't fit with the neighborhood—it is too big to fit with the small single story homes in the area. It will have a negative impact on the current residences with not enough parking on site and noise until 10:00 PM. It will negatively affect the peace and quiet of this neighborhood. There doesn't need to be a rezone on this corner and something this large will be a detriment to the nearby elementary school as well as to those who live next to this monstrosity. It is VERY incompatible with this neighborhood.

Please DO NOT consider a rezone for this corner.

Thanks,
Alenda Coburn

[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

rezone of Parcel #02.095.0031 the old tithing building

1 message

Mel Van Zeben <[redacted]> Sat, May 9, 2026 at 10:41 AM
To: "providencecityutah@gmail.com" <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

I walk around town quite a bit and I saw the sign on the corner about this proposed project. I initially thought this was in reference to a project by Macys. Yesterday I found out that it was concerning the property near the sign. I am in general opposed to this development and here are some reasons why I think so.

1.It's a Historical district and a Historical building. 2.There is commercial space still available in other established and better planned for areas towards Macys.3. Traffic on an a already busy intersection close to a school and other smaller and well integrated businesses will be excessive at times.4. Parking is not adequate as I read the proposal, on street parking will create even more traffic and confusion in the area.5. The potential approval of this project may lead to more requests in these and other residential areas. Some think property values will decrease but I think the property values now make residential home areas cheap to buy compared to zoned commercial areas and may create a run on acquisition of properties.6. The project is large and sticks out from other commercial, city and school properties in this residential-historical area.7.A Fire and emergency response would create chaos in this already busy area.8.What happens if this project fails-would it become all apartments or would it be purchased by someone with lesser intentions commercailly?9. What if it succeeds-will it create a rush to this area to become another large commercial area?10. It looks out of place for our neighborhood hometown feel in this area. 11. I think the increased traffic will create a more potential hazard for the school children using this area ,especially to cross the roads.

I would be in favor if the building was restored to its former Tithing office look and was run as a small cafe (or something like that) and was not expanded much beyond that and without the apartments-we already have apartments and condos! They mentioned entertainment but that already exists in this area . I prefer using the city's activities and the Von Park events myself. Sometimes I even enjoy listening to some of the private events from the Old Rock Church or at the park down the street from me.

Resident of Providence

Mel Van Zeben

[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Re: Rezone of parcel #02-095-0031 from R-1-12 to Multi-use

1 message

Amanda Ashfield <[redacted]>
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

Tue, May 12, 2026 at 7:55 PM

To members of the Providence Planning Commision,

I am concerned about the proposed Providence Town Square Development and do not want it to be approved. I am a resident of Providence and live near the proposed building site. It makes no sense to me that this site in a residential neighborhood would be chosen for commercial development when there is still plenty of room in the nearby commercial part of Providence that is closer to the highway (by Macy's, credit union, etc..). There is even an unused, existing commercial space just one block over that could be filled instead. There is no need to tear down a house and add more traffic congestion between 2 local schools. My main concerns are the abysmal parking plan and potential for late-night noise in a quiet area. I have lived in cities where parking is a nightmare because of poor planning resulting in a dependency on street parking and that is the opposite of what I want for our neighborhood. Residents will be the ones who have to suffer the negative consequences of these issues. Please help keep the peace and character of our quiet neighborhood intact and do not approve this proposal.

Respectfully,
Amanda Ashfield

[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Providence Town Square

1 message

Kyra Moon [redacted] Tue, May 12, 2026 at 10:46 PM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

I am writing to support the proposed mixed use development at 100 North and Main Street. Our family lived in Montreal during the fall and it was really fun for our kids to be able to walk to the bakery and grocery store without having to cross any major streets. It would be great to replicate that experience for kids here without having them walk down to the busier parts of Providence.

I also have good memories of the candy store Johns Place behind the elementary school and think it would be fun to have something like that again.

The location along Main Street makes sense to me even though it's a block north of other commercial buildings. It is close enough to Uptown Park that there should be plenty of parking.

Kyra Moon

UTAH

Tyler Cameron <tcameron@providence.utah.gov>

Fwd: [webform_submission:values:subject:raw]

1 message

Megan McCuistion <meganmccuistion@providence.utah.gov> Mon, May 11, 2026 at 2:36 PM
To: Tyler Cameron <tcameron@providence.utah.gov>

I don't know if everyone got this, or just me through the website contact form. But here's another comment for Jody's project.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **"[webform_submission:values:name:raw]"** <noreply@civicplus.com>
Date: Fri, May 8, 2026 at 8:52 PM
Subject: [webform_submission:values:subject:raw]
To: <meganmccuistion@providence.utah.gov>

Sirs:

I wish to comment about the proposed "Providence Town Square Development". I'd like to ask the City Council not to approve its construction. Besides looking completely out of place it would pose a huge parking problem on that corner of 1st North and Main. Also the music and noise from the development could go on till 10:00 PM nightly, disturbing the usual neighborhood nightly quiet. Again, please appose its construction.

Keith Thompson, 75 West Center street, Providence, Utah

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

In support of Rezoning

1 message

Grace Henderson <[redacted]> Wed, May 13, 2026 at 11:58 AM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

To whom this my concern

I support the proposed rezoning in Providence because I believe it will benefit the community by encouraging thoughtful growth, improving housing opportunities, and supporting local businesses and infrastructure. Responsible development can help meet the needs of current and future residents while strengthening the overall community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Grace Lords - Providence resident
Sent from my iPhone

[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Development

1 message

Shannon Rasmussen [redacted] Wed, May 13, 2026 at 12:05 PM

To: "providencecityutah@gmail.com" <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Why are we not looking at all the land already for sale by Maceys for development instead of a residential neighborhood? Also consider the lack of parking especially in the winter when we have to be off the streets. This is not a good plan at all ! What about property values of the homes around this proposed development - they will go down in value . Let's look at the aesthetic value of the area instead of $$$$$$$$$. This is a neighborhood for homes not store fronts or apartments.

[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Opposition Item No. 2 on May 13th Agenda

1 message

Lacee Boschetto [redacted]>
To: "providencecityutah@gmail.com" <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Wed, May 13, 2026 at 1:11 PM

Dear Members of the Providence Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning for the Providence Town Square development. While the proposal attempts to market itself through clever phrases like "boutique downtown," this language creates a façade of small-town character rather than preserving the authentic identity that once existed in Providence. Why add the last nail to the coffin by transforming one of the few remaining areas of Providence that has not yet been sullied by developers whose priorities will always favor profits over Providence tradition? Once the character of Providence is gone, it cannot be reclaimed.

My family's ties to Providence run generations deep. My grandfather built many of the homes in this downtown area, contributing to the craftsmanship, pride, and community character that made Providence what it is. This area represents more than an easy opportunity for a commercial cash grab; it represents the history and identity of families who helped shape this town long before developers saw greedy opportunities. Despite the developer claiming to "use architectural details and materials from the existing home on sections of the buildings", no amount of reclaimed wood can mimic the classic design of the surrounding homes and historical buildings.

While developers attempt to aesthetically mimic the history of Providence in this mixed-use space, residents with deep roots remember the actual commercial history of downtown Providence. Commercial spaces down the street from this site included the Country Shopper grocery store, the Country Boy Hamburger restaurant, Watkins Printing, and a gas station. For decades, residents had the opportunity to support this type of true hometown downtown experience, but over time, many chose to support businesses outside the city limits for greater variety and lower prices, rather than local downtown convenience. That reality cannot simply be recreated through "boutique" style development. Much of the former commercial space in downtown Providence is currently underutilized and offers a promising opportunity for this developer to construct their vision for this type of downtown experience.

Providence has already experienced a neck-breaking amount of expansion, making the city nearly unrecognizable. This downtown area is one of the last places where I don't feel like I have to gird my loins to deal with the traffic congestion created by the commercial expansion just west of here. Many residents feel that the identity of this town is slowly being traded away, piece by piece, to appease developers and pad their profits.

While the proposal presents an idealized vision of pedestrian-centered commerce, it fails to account for the actual behaviors, infrastructure limitations, and parking demands that currently exist in Providence.

- The proposal discusses offering the minimum parking for mixed-use zoning, but it does not adequately account for other parking needs. Even small businesses typically require between one and three employees per shift, particularly a proposed café or coffee shop that may operate during extended morning and evening hours. Where are these employees expected to park? Will they occupy the already limited on-site parking spaces, reducing availability for patrons, or are employees expected to park blocks away in surrounding neighborhoods to preserve parking for customers? Simply using the church parking as a remedy doesn't display thoughtful planning. This issue becomes even more significant during peak business hours, school traffic times, and when baseball

tournaments take over this city block. Not to mention the extra work required to maintain these sidewalks and parking areas with snowfall.

- The proposal does not provide realistic projections regarding the amount of foot traffic necessary to sustain these businesses. Given the small size of the proposed commercial spaces, businesses would likely need consistently high customer volume to remain profitable, especially given the cost of commercial rent. Small businesses operating with limited inventory space and limited parking accessibility already face substantial challenges. Without a strong, reliable customer base, what is the city's plan to prevent these commercial units from eventually [redacted] vacant storefronts like those of former businesses in this area?

- The proposal also assumes a level of pedestrian activity that does not reflect the established habits of Providence residents. The majority of Providence households are not within practical walking distance of this location. More importantly, current community behavior demonstrates that Providence is not functioning as a pedestrian-oriented town. Every morning, residents living less than a mile from this area routinely drive their children to school rather than walk or bike. This is just one example of reality that directly contradicts the idealistic pedestrian imagery presented. Let's be honest, residents living further than a mile from this location will drive and park.

- If the true intention is to encourage walking and biking, the proposal should clearly identify the infrastructure necessary to support that goal. Where are the designated bike rack spaces? Where is the evidence demonstrating that Providence residents are realistically likely to change long-established transportation habits to support this model?

I also urge the planning commission to recognize that the developer appears to be heavily focused on projects within Providence. This naturally raises an important question for residents: Is this development driven by a genuine investment in the long-term well-being and character of the city, or has Providence become an attractive target because developers know the city planning commission will continually bend and adjust zoning requirements for their projects? Residents deserve assurance that zoning decisions are made in the best interest of the sustainability of these proposed projects, not what is most profitable for developers. If the planning commission is truly interested in representing the needs and wants of community members and there is an immediate need to use this lot, why not reach out to residents for ideas that address their needs?

I was born and raised in Providence, where I've lived for 33 years. Unfortunately, I chose to remain silent on the other rezoning requests because I was hopeful the planning commission would make decisions that supported this city's history and tradition. However, I can't remain silent anymore out of fear of the future. After spending 12 years of my young adulthood living in California before returning home to Providence, I have seen firsthand how these seemingly small rezoning "baby steps" become the foundation for much larger leaps in development that completely change the dynamics of a small town. What begins as a single ambitious project eventually becomes the justification for the next, and then the next, until the community's original identity is gone entirely. I hope that the planning commission considers which definition of quality of life they support. The definition that preserves the character of Providence, or the definition that transforms this small city into the regional examples provided by the developer. I don't know about the committee, but I've never visited Ogden 25th Street or Downtown Provo and said to myself, "This space would be better if it were right across the street from homes." How long will it be before this project is expanded and the next set of rezoning requests occur, allowing the developer to purchase and demolish the surrounding homes to make this "boutique downtown" larger?

I recognize that growth is inevitable, but I also wonder where the planning commission draws the line. It takes a responsible and steady hand to pause development and let residents breathe a little before they see another rezoning notice or a new construction site. I urge the Providence Planning Commission to reject this rezoning proposal and instead prioritize preservation, thoughtful planning, and the voices of residents who have invested generations into this community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lacee Rasmussen Boschetto

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Support

1 message

Heidi Parson <[redacted]> Wed, May 13, 2026 at 1:57 PM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

I cast My vote in support of Providence Town Square development.

Heidi Parson

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

Support for Providence Community Town Square Project

1 message

Jessenia Coombs <[redacted]> Wed, May 13, 2026 at 5:58 PM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

Dear Providence City Council,

I'm writing to express my support for the proposed town square project and rezoning request. I believe this vision would be such a meaningful addition to our community and a beautiful way to preserve part of Providence's history while creating a gathering space for families and residents to enjoy.

I especially appreciate the thoughtful intention to incorporate materials and elements from the historic home into the new space rather than simply removing it entirely. Projects that prioritize community connection, preservation, and thoughtful growth are so valuable for the future of Providence.

I hope you will give this project your consideration and support. Thank you for the time and care you give to decisions that shape our community.

Best,

Jessenia Coombs

[redacted]

Gmail

Providence Utah <providencecityutah@gmail.com>

New shops in Providence

1 message

Corey Pickett <[redacted]> Thu, May 14, 2026 at 7:09 AM
To: providencecityutah@gmail.com

Hi!
I'm writing to say that I support Jody Robbins latest development idea in Providence. I think having shops downtown would be amazing.

Thanks,

Corey Pickett