

Administrative Land Use Authority (ALUA)

Minutes –July 15th, 2026 – 1:30 pm

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

Call to Order: Skarlet Bankhead, Chair.

ALUA Members: Skarlet Bankhead, Rob Stapley & Steven Wood (Via Phone)

Staff in Attendance: Zoning Specialist Colton Love & City Recorder Ty Cameron.

Approval of the Minutes: The Administrative Land Use Authority will approve the minutes of the last meeting, which was held on July 8th, 2026. **(MINUTES)**

- Chair Bankhead opened the item by asking whether the members had reviewed the minutes from the July 8th, 2026, meeting. City Engineer Wood confirmed he had reviewed them and found them to be thorough and detailed, offering no changes. Public Works Director Stapley likewise had no changes and acknowledged the quality of the record

Motion to approve the minutes of July 8th, 2026, ALUA meeting as presented was made by City Engineer Steven Wood and seconded by Public Works Director Rob Stapley.

Vote:

Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Rob Stapley & Steven Wood.

Nay-

Abstained-

Motion passes, minutes approved.

Discussion Items:

- **Item No. 1 Lot Line Adjustment:** ALUA will review, discuss and may take action on a Lot Consolidation/Boundary Line adjusting a common boundary line between parcels 02-093-0007 & 02-093-0006 located in the general area of 175 N 100 W. **(EXHIBITS)**

- ALUA review, discussion, and action on a Lot Consolidation/Boundary Line Adjustment adjusting a common boundary line between parcels 02-093-0007 and 02-093-0006, located in the general area of 175 N 100 W.

Staff Report

- Zoning Technician Colton Love presented the staff report. He noted that the application, received July 1st, 2026, was submitted by applicant Adam Tripp and pertained to properties at 175 North 100 West and 191 North 100 West, both zoned R-1-12. Love summarized the applicable legal framework, citing Utah Code Title 10, Chapter 9A, Part 6 governing subdivisions, Providence City Code 2-4-1 establishing the ALUA as the land use authority for lot line adjustments, and Utah Code 10-9a-606 setting requirements for lot line adjustments. He confirmed that the proposed adjustment was consistent with the general plan and surrounding development, and that all resulting lots would meet or exceed the minimum lot size and the required 95-foot lot width. Staff outlined conditions requiring continued compliance with all applicable federal, state, county, and Providence City codes, and noted that a notice of lot line adjustment approval would need to be recorded with the Cache County Recorder.

Discussion — Non-Conforming Structures

- Chair Bankhead led the substantive discussion, noting she had identified several concerns regarding non-conforming structures on the parcels as they related to the proposed new boundary line.
- The first and most significant concern involved a historic granary located on the north portion of the property. Under the proposed new boundary line, the granary would be positioned only approximately one foot from the new lot line, creating a non-compliant setback condition that did not previously exist. Chair Bankhead noted this situation had apparently been anticipated and previously discussed informally, as the applicant's representative acknowledged awareness that a decision would need to be made. The option of shifting the proposed boundary line further to the west was raised, but the applicant confirmed this was not feasible due to the configuration of a wall on the existing house. After brief deliberation, the applicant and property owner agreed that the granary — described as being approximately 100 years old — would be demolished to allow the boundary line to remain as proposed. The property owner expressed reluctance but accepted this as the necessary course of action.
- Chair Bankhead then turned to the large building in the southwest corner of the property, noting it was already non-conforming with respect to the south property line — a condition that predated the current application, as Providence City had issued the original building permit in 2013. The Authority clarified that this non-conformity was not being increased by the proposed adjustment, and therefore the building would not be required to move as part of this action. However, Chair Bankhead made clear that should any modifications be made to that building in the future, it would be required to come into full zoning compliance, which would necessitate moving it at least two and a half to three feet to the north, and potentially more depending on the building's height.
- A small structure near the north end of the property, measuring under 200 square feet and set approximately 3.5 feet from the line, was noted to be within the allowable threshold and required no action.
- The building in the northwest corner of the property was also identified as non-conforming at its current location, being larger than 200 square feet. Chair Bankhead noted that any future changes to that structure would require it to be relocated — moved approximately 20 feet to the south and a couple of feet to the east — to achieve compliance with street-side setback requirements. The Authority emphasized that this obligation would exist regardless of the lot line adjustment, as the building was already non-compliant.
- The primary residence on each parcel was confirmed to meet all current setback requirements. All remaining structures were identified as accessory buildings, with no accessory dwelling units present on either parcel.
- Public Works Director Stapley also raised a carport structure located on the west side of the gravel driveway near the shop, noting it would be subject to the same non-conforming status as the larger shed. He clarified that any future modification or upgrade to the carport would require it to be brought into conformance with applicable setbacks given its proximity to the frontage boundary line. The applicants confirmed the carport currently sits on gravel, not a concrete slab.

Discussion — Utilities

- Public Works Director Stapley raised a question regarding the utility configuration across the two parcels, noting he wanted to confirm that each main house had its own independent water and sewer connections. The applicants confirmed that the electric service to the shop in the southwest corner was currently being drawn from the house on Parcel B, and that neither the garages nor the accessory structures had independent water or sewer service. Mr. Stapley noted his recollection that the water meter for the existing home connects to the 1st West water main,

93 while the sewer appears to run out to the 2nd North Sewer main. He observed that the proposed
94 lot line adjustment would have the beneficial effect of aligning utilities with their respective tax
95 ID parcels, eliminating what had been an irregular cross-parcel utility arrangement. The
96 applicant's representative confirmed this was one of the motivating factors behind the
97 application.

- 98 • Director Stapley also noted that the adjustment would eliminate an informal or improperly
99 recorded easement that had provided access to a back portion of the property, further tidying the
100 property's legal configuration.

101 **Discussion — Address Change**

- 102 • Property owner Dixie Creasy raised the question of whether this was an appropriate time to
103 correct the address of the home on the parcel, explaining that the address of 191 North 100 West
104 had been assigned approximately 47 years ago when the house was originally planned to front
105 1st West. The City had subsequently required the house to be positioned further into the lot, but
106 the address was never updated. As a result, the address did not correspond accurately to the
107 property's actual location and had caused recurring confusion with deliveries and navigation.
108 Creasy suggested the address might more appropriately be something along the lines of 191
109 North 150 West.
- 110 • Chair Bankhead and Public Works Director Stapley discussed the practical implications, noting
111 that the house fronts 2nd North, meaning an address correction would change both the north and
112 west coordinates simultaneously — a more complex change than simply renumbering along a
113 single street. Mr. Stapley noted his recollection that the water meter connects to 1st West, while
114 the sewer ties into 2nd North.
- 115 • City Engineer Wood acknowledged that updating the address would better reflect the property's
116 actual location and frontage but cautioned that simultaneously changing both components of the
117 address would create significant administrative confusion for the property owner, including an
118 extensive paper trail of records updates. He expressed reluctance to recommend the change on
119 that basis. Given this concern, the property owner agreed to leave the address as it currently
120 stands.

121 **Classification as Simple Boundary Adjustment**

- 122 • Chair Bankhead reviewed the applicable state code definition and determined that the proposed
123 action qualified as a simple boundary adjustment, as it did not affect any public right-of-way, did
124 not affect any existing properly recorded easements, did not involve on-site wastewater systems,
125 and did not create or increase any internal lot non-conformities — provided the granary was
126 removed as agreed.
- 127 • City Engineer Wood concurred with this classification, affirming that the concerns raised by
128 Chair Bankhead and Director Stapley had been adequately addressed and that he saw no
129 impediment to approving the adjustment as a simple boundary adjustment.

130 **Summary of Conditions**

- 131 • Before entertaining a motion, Chair Bankhead summarized the conditions associated with
132 approval as follows: the small granary building on the northwest portion of proposed Parcel A
133 must be demolished; the large building in the southwest corner of proposed Parcel B is non-
134 conforming and, if modified in the future, must be brought into zoning compliance, which would
135 require relocation; and the building in the northwest corner of proposed Parcel B is similarly
136 non-conforming and, if modified, would need to be relocated approximately 20 feet to the south
137 and several feet to the east. All parties confirmed their understanding of these conditions.

Motion to approve the lot line adjustment between parcels 02-093-0007 and 02-093-0006 at 175 North 1st West, subject to the conditions as outlined during the meeting, was made by Public Works Director Rob Stapley and seconded by City Engineer Steven Wood.

Vote:

Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Rob Stapley & Steven Wood.

Nay-

Abstained-

Motion passes.

- Chair Bankhead advised the applicant and property owner that staff would prepare the necessary paperwork to complete the boundary adjustment.
- Chair Bankhead also noted for the record that the Authority anticipates at least two additional agenda items for the following Wednesday's ALUA meeting, including a conditional use permit application, and confirmed with City Engineer Wood that the 1:30 PM meeting time would work within his schedule.

Motion to adjourn was made by City Engineer Steven Wood and seconded by Public Works Director Rob Stapley.

Vote:

Yea- Skarlet Bankhead, Rob Stapley & Steven Wood.

Nay-

Abstained-

Motion passes. Meeting adjourned.

Minutes approved by vote of ALUA on _____ day of _____ 2026.

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

Ty Cameron, City Recorder