

Providence City Planning Commission Agenda
Providence City Office Building, 15 South Main, Providence UT 84332
March 4, 2015

The Providence City Planning Commission will begin discussing the following agenda items at 6:00 p.m.
Anyone interested is invited to attend.

Approval of the Minutes:

Item No. 1. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of February 25, 2015.

Action Items:

Item No. 1. Proposed general plan amendment. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for recommendation to the Providence City Council proposed amendments to the transportation element of the Providence City general plan.

Staff Reports: Any items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as informational only.

Commission Reports: Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as informational only; no formal action will be taken.

Agenda posted by Skarlet Bankhead on February 27, 2015.


-Skarlet Bankhead
City Recorder

If you have a disability and/or need special assistance while attending the Providence City Planning Commission meeting, please call 435-752-9441 before 5:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.

Pursuant to Utah Code 52-4-207 Electronic Meetings – Authorization – Requirements the following notice is hereby given:

- Providence City Ordinance Modification 016-2006, adopted 11/14/2006, allows Planning Commission Member(s) to attend by teleconference.
- The anchor location for this meeting is: Providence City Office Building, 15 South Main, Providence, UT.
- Member(s) may be connected to the electronic meeting by teleconference.

Providence City Council Members may be in attendance at this meeting; however, no Council action will be taken even if a Quorum exists.

1 **Providence City Planning Commission Meeting**
2 **Providence City Office Building**
3 **15 South Main, Providence UT 84332**
4 **February 25, 2015 6:00 pm**
5

6 **Attendance:**

7 Chair: Larry Raymond
8 Members: Kirk Allen, Larry Hogge, Sherman Sanders
9 Alternates: Wendy Simmons, Heather Hansen
10 Excused: Robert James
11

12 **Approval of the Minutes:**

13 **Item No. 1.** The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for approval the minutes of
14 February 11, 2015.

15 **Motion to accept the minutes of February 11, 2015: L Hogge, second – S Sanders**

- 16 • Page 3, Line 21 – City has oversight

17 **Vote: Yea: K Allen, L Hogge, L Raymond, S Sanders, W Simmons**

18 **Nay: None**

19 **Excused: R James**

20 **Abstained: None**
21

22 Action Item No. 2 was discussed before the public hearing.

23 **Item No. 2.** Proposed Code Amendment. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider
24 for recommendation to the Providence City Council proposed amendments to Providence City
25 Code Title 11 Subdivision Regulations by changing “Development Review Committee (DRC)” to
26 “City staff”.

- 27 • W Simmons suggested City Executive Staff as a replacement for “City Staff”.
28 • H Hansen suggested listing titles of those who are actually on the review staff, then they
29 could be referred to as “City Executive Staff”.
30 • K Allen felt “city staff” was adequate.
31 • L Raymond wanted to make sure people understand that not just anyone will be
32 reviewing plans, but that certain people will be reviewing plans.

33 **Motion to list the city administrator, public works director, city engineer, public works**
34 **secretary, zoning personnel, mayor and council member as the review staff, hereafter named**
35 **“City Executive Staff”. W Simmons, second – S Sanders**

36 **Vote: Yea: L Hogge, L Raymond, S Sanders, W Simmons**

37 **Nay: K Allen**

38 **Excused: None**

39 **Abstained: None**
40

41 **Public Hearing (6:15 p.m.):**

1 Item No. 1. Proposed General Plan Amendment. The Providence City Planning Commission will
2 hold a public hearing to receive public comment on proposed amendments to the
3 transportation element of the Providence City general plan.

- 4 • Public hearing opened at 6:20 pm.
- 5 • Cindy Dunkley, 615 E. 675 S. Providence, read a petition to the commission. (See
6 attached petition). She said there were other locations in the city that only have one
7 access point and felt the Cove did not need another access point.
- 8 • Craig Dunkley said all signatures on the petition are people who live in the Cove
9 Subdivision.
- 10 • Seth Wold recently relocated to Providence, lives in the Cove and purposely built there
11 because it was a cul-de-sac. He asks that the road no go through.
- 12 • Susan Eliason has lived in the Cove for almost 5 years. Was promised there would be no
13 road that goes through this cul-de-sac. She felt it would be unsafe to open the cul-de-
14 sac onto Canyon Road.
- 15 • Kaylene Wootton has lived in the subdivision for 6 years. Moved there knowing it was a
16 closed cul-de-sac. She feels opening the road would be dangerous and that people may
17 speed if the street is opened up. She would like to sign the petition.
- 18 • Casey Sutherland said the intersection of Canyon Road and the Cove would be an offset
19 intersection. He felt that would add more traffic concerns. He does not see the benefit
20 of opening up that street. He thinks the street should remain a cul-de-sac.
- 21 • K Allen asked if there were any lots left to be developed.
- 22 • C Dunkley said when it is built out, there will be 24 total homes.
- 23 • K Allen commented that where the proposed street connects to Canyon Road, there is
24 an irrigation gate there and the water would need to be diverted.
- 25 • C Sutherland asked if the road was opened, would the city put a stop sign or a yield sign.
26 He asked if there was a budget defined for this project.
- 27 • K Allen said that would be decided by city engineer and those who control the budget.
- 28 • Nathan Holman also a resident of the Cove, selected that location because it was a cul-
29 de-sac. Feels the benefit does not outweigh the risks of opening that road. He opposes
30 opening that road and asked why it was even being considered.
- 31 • L Raymond said the commission was considering areas in the city that need a second
32 ingress/egress.
- 33 • W Simmons commented that in case there is a problem and the end of the road at the
34 top is inaccessible, the commission felt a second ingress/egress would benefit the
35 residents.
- 36 • H Hansen commented that perhaps the road could be one-way only and asked how
37 residents of the Cove felt about that.
- 38 • Cove residents voiced that there would still be additional traffic even though it would
39 only be one-way.
- 40 • K Allen asked if the City owned a right of way in the Cove.
- 41 • S Bankhead said there is an easement, but not a right of way.
- 42 • K Allen said that building the road down to Canyon Road would be a steep grade and
43 would need retaining walls. He thought it could be problematic.

- 1 • J Baldwin agrees with the residents of the Cove. It has been pre-approved and pre-
2 engineered and should be left alone. He commented that the future round about on 200
3 N. 300 E. would be expensive and said none of his neighbors that live in that area want a
4 roundabout. He feels there are other ways to negotiate that intersection that do not
5 include a roundabout. He would like to see a 4 way stop or moving the road to align the
6 intersection.
- 7 • S Bankhead said there are other types of roundabouts that would not cost \$800,000.
- 8 • K Allen said an "S" curve could be an option.
- 9 • J Baldwin also had a concern on 3rd South coming off the hill. He thinks the grade
10 coming off the hill is a steep grade and does not think that would be a wise decision to
11 put a street there. He thanked the commission for all the work they have put into
12 redoing the transportation plan.
- 13 • Craig Dunkley commented that it is important to him to maintain the Cove the way it
14 was designed. It works fine and there is nothing illegal about the way it is now.
- 15 • Kristy Hodson has lived in the Cove just a little over a year ago. Has four children and felt
16 this was a safe neighborhood because of the restricted traffic. She would love to see it
17 left alone. Feels there are a lot of blind spots already, which the residents are aware of,
18 but other traffic may not.
- 19 • L Raymond asked about the blind corner in the winter.
- 20 • K Hodson said it is a bit scary in the winter. The plows have been good to keep it clean in
21 the winter, and the residents are aware and are careful going up and down that street.
- 22 • S Bankhead asked the residents of the Cove what were some of the other roads in the
23 city they felt needed to be addressed.
- 24 • Chuck Apgar currently owns the last home in the subdivision and said often people try
25 to use the road as a shortcut. He feels the kids in the neighborhood have grown up with
26 free access to that street for riding bikes, etc. and does not want to see the street
27 opened.
- 28 • Garrett Harding read a couple of letters to the commission opposing opening the cul-de-
29 sac. See attached letters. G Harding works in public transportation and feels these cul-
30 de-sac neighborhoods offer a safe haven to children who live in them. The grade would
31 be a concern. Engineering would impact existing homes. Feels opening the road would
32 change that dramatically.
- 33 • Arden Draney lives at 590 Canyon Road where the proposed street would intersect with
34 Canyon Road. He said connecting the Cove to Canyon Road would require taking out all
35 his trees in order to make it a safe intersection and all the Highlands traffic would be
36 using that road.
- 37 • Craig Dunkley said Providence has a lot of roads that need repairs before new roads are
38 built.
- 39 • Nathan Holman feels that in Cache Valley in general there are a lot of areas lacking
40 major corridors to direct traffic from east bench down to Main in Logan.
- 41 • K Allen said that in developing the transportation corridor plan, the commission looks at
42 future development. The commission is trying to avoid future issues similar to what we
43 have in Fox Ridge area.

- J Baldwin said growth has occurred in Providence and in order to provide transportation corridors to handle traffic, major thoroughfares are going to impact some of the homes in the community at risk. We are a bedroom community of 25 mph streets and does not want major transportation corridors. He also thinks the proposed 380 N street is unnecessary.
- K Allen felt there were no streets in Providence that would be 40 mph corridors except maybe the highway or the proposed future Grandview Drive.
- L Raymond closed the public hearing at 7:10 pm. He reminded those in attendance that there was more to recommend to the City Council than just the transportation corridor plan. There is also verbiage that needs to be discussed. There may not be a vote specifically on the Cove subdivision tonight.

Action Items:

Item No. 1. Proposed general plan amendment. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for recommendation to the Providence City Council proposed amendments to the transportation element of the Providence City general plan.

- L Raymond felt the commission was not ready to make a complete recommendation to the City Council and would like this continued. He said he would entertain a motion concerning the Cove to Canyon Road extension.

Motion to strike from the transportation corridor plan the segment of road connecting Cove Street to Canyon Road and consider at a later date other proposals for the transportation element of the general plan: L Hogge, second – S Sanders

- S Sanders said that even though he seconded the motion, he wants it noted that anytime something is on the master plan, it is subject to change.
- K Allen said he is not opposed to striking this from the transportation plan, but he does not want to chop the plan up into bits and pieces to send to the city council. He would like to focus on the entire plan. Chopping it up into bits and pieces delays the process and makes it more difficult to get a comprehensive plan submitted to the council. Traffic throughout the entire city needs to be considered. Master plans do and will change.
- L Hogge asked if any more public hearings were required.
- S Bankhead said since there was a public hearing another one is not required, but one can be scheduled.
- L Hogge said tonight's discussion mainly focused on the Cove, but there are other areas of the city that are of concern.
- S Sanders said this has been discussed for the past six months and it can be voted on tonight.
- K Allen said this should be opened back up to a public hearing once a more concrete comprehensive plan is in place with specific ideas of what improvements can be made to the transportation plan.
- L Hogge felt there needs to be more discussion on some of the other areas, but a vote can be taken tonight on the Cove extension to Canyon Road.

Vote: Yea: S Sanders, L Hogge, W Simmons

Nay: K Allen, L Raymond

Excused: R James

Abstained: None

- H Hansen feels there are too many streets on the north east section of the map. If 200 North is planned as a main corridor, then 400 East does not need further development. 300 E. down the hill is too steep. She feels there are four intersections heavily impacted when the new high school is opened: Baer Welding intersection, the T at 200 W. 100 N., Center Street/200 W., 300 S. 200 W. intersection. These are her priorities. She does not like Center Street cutting through Zollinger Park connecting to Gateway Drive. 200 W. 100 N. needs a roundabout. 100 South going east to Gateway Drive roundabout is questionable.
- L Raymond asked where the idea of a corridor dividing Zollinger Park came from. S Bankhead said it was part of the charrettes from the Landscape Architecture/Environmental Planning students from USU.
- L Raymond asked if the city requested the study.
- S Bankhead said she didn't know who asked for it, but the city paid for it. She feels it is difficult to get from the east bench to Gateway Drive and relocating some of the features of Zollinger Park for future traffic flow may be necessary.
- K Allen thought a walking path through that area (soccer fields) might be a better idea rather than a traffic corridor.
- L Raymond said our east/west roads don't convey traffic in Providence very well.
- K Allen said opening up 100 South would be a great alternative to cutting through Zollinger Park.
- S Bankhead said that doesn't get any of the east bench traffic.
- K Allen said 10th South to Main (in Millville) to 5th North can move a lot of traffic. West of that will be the new high school.
- S Bankhead said Millville is built right up to our Main Street and they are waiting for that road to be developed.
- W Simmons said developing Main will probably not happen until someone passes.
- S Bankhead said that will probably happen when someone purchases that ground and develops it.
- K Allen said in order for Logan to provide appropriate corridors in their city, they had to take down homes. He asked if Providence would consider that.
- K Allen and W Simmons suggested continuing this discussion and bringing a map large enough for everyone to sit around and have this discussion so everyone is on the same subject at the same time.

Motion to continue to March 4th to finalize plans for transportation corridor: W Simmons, second – K Allen

Vote: Yea: K Allen, L Hogge, L Raymond, W Simmons

Nay: S Sanders

Excused: R James

Abstained: None

Item No. 3. Proposed Code Amendment. The Providence City Planning Commission will consider for recommendation to the Providence City Council proposed amendments to Providence City Code Title 10 Chapter 6 Use Regulations. Use Chart proposed amendments include allowing

1 Radio/TV/cellular tower as a conditional use in the Public Use District, and changes to
2 beekeeping.

- 3 • S Bankhead suggested moving forward with the cell tower amendment, but continuing
- 4 the beekeeping portion until we know what the state legislature is going to do.
- 5 • S Sanders had a question about how a conditional use permit is granted for cell towers.
- 6 • S Bankhead said there are guidelines that need to be followed in order to get a
- 7 conditional use permit. Also, the city owns the parks so we have control over where cell
- 8 towers would be permitted.
- 9 • L Raymond suggested continuing the beekeeping portion, but moving the cell tower
- 10 portion forward.

11 **Motion to approve cell tower as a conditional use in the Public Use zone: S Sanders, second –**
12 **W Simmons**

13 **Vote: Yea: K Allen, L Hogge, L Raymond, S Sanders, W Simmons**
14 **Nay: None**
15 **Excused: R James**
16 **Abstained: None**

17
18 **Staff Reports:** Any items presented by Providence City Staff will be presented as informational
19 only.

- 20 • No staff reports.

21
22 **Commission Reports:** Items presented by the Commission Members will be presented as
23 informational only; no formal action will be taken.

- 24 • No commission reports.

25
26 **Motion to adjourn: S Sanders, second – L Hogge**

27 **Vote: Yea: K Allen, L Hogge, L Raymond, S Sanders, W Simmons**
28 **Nay: None**
29 **Excused: R James**
30 **Abstained: None**

31
32 Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

33 Minutes recorded by S Bankhead and prepared by C Craven.

34
35
36
37
38 _____
39 Larry Raymond, Chairman

Caroline Craven, Secretary

Transportation Corridors

Including: Roads, Streets, Alternate Transportation Systems

Background

Roads/Streets

Road/street planning in Providence was sided by passage of the subdivision ordinances, which require consistent types of streets throughout the City. Planning Commissions and City Councils have revised and modified the street ordinances in attempts to better meet changing conditions.

The City currently has three types of streets:

1. Feeder Street: A street which carries traffic to a collector street system and shall have a designated right of way of fifty-six feet (56'). Except when used in a cul-de-sac, feeder streets shall not exceed 350' in length and shall not be adjacent to more than eight (8) lots.
2. Collector Street: A street which carries traffic to the major street system, and shall have a right of way of sixty-six feet (66').
3. Major Street: A street which serves as a major traffic way, a controlled-access highway, major street parkway, or other equivalent term to identify those streets comprising the basic structure of the street plan, and shall have a designated right of way of eighty feet (80').

Private streets are allowed; but must be built to the above standards.

As development plans are reviewed, those involved in the review and approval processes rely on the Utah Code, the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the City Code, the Public Works Standards and Specifications Manual, and any other applicable codes and/or standards.

The City code requires connectivity of new streets with existing streets and that the arrangement of streets in new developments provide for the continuation of streets to adjoining undeveloped areas. Because connectivity throughout the City is important, the use of cul-de-sacs should be limited. The City Code defines a cul-de-sac as: A street having one open end and being terminated at the other end by a vehicular turnaround; and shall not exceed 600' in length. A connector street shall be used if the cul-de-sac contains sixteen (16) or more lots. A feeder street may be used in a cul-de-sac containing fifteen (15) lots or less.

Providence City is a member of the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO); as a member of that body, the City is involved in transportation planning at a countywide level. Proposed corridors and layout from the countywide plan have been incorporated into the City's plan.

Providence City has one State road, SR165; and one County road (CR238) within the City's boundaries.

Principles

Provide safe, flexible, and accessible transportation corridors throughout the City.

Integrate alternative means of transportation, including public transportation, pedestrian travel, and bicycle friendly routes.

Transportation Plan Directive

Planning for transportation is an integral part of the community General Plan. Safe and efficient transportation corridors are important to the economy of the city and the well-being of its citizens. Corridors should maximize the potential for life safety, consider the needs of vehicle, pedestrian, and alternate transportation means, and add aesthetic value to neighborhoods, commercial areas, and

industrial/manufacturing areas. Current vehicular routing problems must be resolved. Future needs, including alternative transportation systems, must be considered.

Vehicle trip counts and traffic engineering studies

In June 2007 Providence City increased the minimum park strip width to six feet (6'). Thus enabling a greater variety of street trees to be appropriately placed, provide a greater distance between pedestrian and vehicle, and assist in snow removal and storage. It also has the effect of traffic calming (creating a sense of need for slower speed on a narrower pavement section).

Map 1 indicates general locations where major transportation corridors may be placed to provide adequate ingress/egress, and access throughout Providence. Minor deviation in placement of these corridors is anticipated inasmuch as the specific route illustrated may be unobtainable. The map suggests an appropriate right-of-way section for each corridor. Redundant accesses should be provided for new subdivisions which will reduce the traffic through the downtown area. Coordination of future streets with the Cache Metropolitan Planning Organization (CMPO) plan is advised. Coordination with adjacent cities is vital to implement a traffic corridor which will reduce the already impacted Highways 89-91 and 165 (Logan Main Street). The City should consider means to obtain rights-of-way for the proposed roads as funds permit. Negotiation, and eminent domain, if required, may be used as a last resort to implement the concepts of the Transportation Plan.

Alternative transportation systems must be considered for both existing corridors as well as new developments. Alternative systems include, but are not limited to: accessible pedestrian walkways, Urban Trails (discussed elsewhere in the General Plan), bike paths, and public transit.

It is the intent of the Transportation Plan that the Planning Commission recommend the final location of proposed corridors in harmony with the guidelines stated herein.

Current concerns include:

East Benches:

Growth in Providence has occurred along the east bench areas. Traffic from the north bench area is funneled onto Center Street through the downtown area, creating safety concerns, and potential for congestion. Prior to the construction of 1000 South, Canyon road had been the traditional conduit for much of the south bench also funneling traffic to the downtown area.

Areas with Limited Ingress and Egress:

Areas of Providence have been developed with limited access, generally having only one street. The interests of safety and convenience suggest that good planning will address multiple accesses to all areas of Providence. To provide connectivity, the use of cul-de-sacs should be limited.

Alternative Transportation Systems:

Investigation of alternate means of transportation is as important an issue as is creating new roads for vehicular travel. Bus, light rail, bike paths, walking paths are an important part of transportation issues. The City will work with the CMPO and Cache Valley Transit District (CVTD) to coordinate alternative transportation systems.

Variations/exceptions from the ordinances:

At times, deviation from the ordinances have led to less than desirable outcomes relative to walks, park strips, curb and gutter placement, and storm water control, which deviated from the standards included in the ordinances and Public Works Standards and Specifications Manual.

Conformance to the intent of the ordinance is vital. Deviations should not be allowed for the convenience of a developer. However, creative concepts that work within the ordinances are encouraged when applied to entire developments.

Future growth will compound these problems. Creative and careful planning is needed to anticipate transportation needs in advance of newly developing areas.

Future Needs:

- A capital facilities plan for transportation corridors should be drafted, along with updating the 1997 Impact Fee Analysis.
- A bench corridor, near the power lines, not only incorporates the CMPO plan for multi-city connectivity, but also allows bench traffic to travel north/south without impacting the lower downtown neighborhoods.
- Connecting the area of 500 North to Spring Creek Parkway will help with concerns in the north.
- Routing traffic north on 300 East should be a top priority. A proposed roundabout at 200 North will promote better traffic flow.
- Development of 200 North east and west is one of the best immediate solutions. Long range solutions are through land not yet annexed to the city.
- Continuation of Gateway Dr to 300 South and beyond will aid the commercial area.
- With the rebuild and extension of Gateway Drive that occurred in conjunction with Logan City's 100 East project, the City anticipates approximately 7000 ADT at the intersection of Gateway Dr and 100 North. The City should consider a round-about at this intersection to alleviate additional emissions from stacking.
- 400 East south of Canyon Road On April 22, 2008, the Providence City Council approved Resolution 08-006 a resolution establishing guidelines for the right-of-way for Canyon Road and 400 East between Canyon Road and the City's south Boundary line.
- The intersection of Canyon Road and 400 East should be improved to provide better vision to the east, and better traffic flow in general. The installation of a round-about has been suggested.
- Continue 500 East from Canyon Road to 1000 South and beyond.
- Continue 300 East, at approximately 870 South, south as a complying paved road.
- In the downtown area, each street has been considered and should be improved in accordance with the Downtown Street Cross-Sections. In general sidewalks will be placed at the property line; however, in areas with existing sidewalk, new sidewalk will be placed to allow a smooth transition. Curb, gutter, and asphalt width will be installed in accordance with the Downtown Street Cross-Sections.

PROVIDENCE CITY MASTER PLAN

SHEET No. 1

TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR PLAN

THIS MAP IS THE PLAN FOR FUTURE
MAJOR TRAFFIC CORRIDORS WITHIN THE
CURRENT & FUTURE CITY BOUNDARIES.

LAST REVISION: FEBRUARY 9, 2015



Scale: 1" = 100' (Horizontal) 1" = 200' (Vertical)

LEGEND

	PROVIDENCE CORPORATE LIMITS
	FUTURE PROVIDENCE CORP. LIMITS
	NEIGHBORING CITY LIMITS
	SECTION CORNER
	AREA OF EXISTING PROVIDENCE CITY CORPORATE LIMITS
	EXISTING STREET OR ROAD
	FUTURE TRAFFIC CORRIDOR 66 FOOT R/W U.N.O.
	FUTURE 80 FOOT CORRIDOR
	UPGRADE EXISTING CORRIDOR
	FUTURE ROUNDABOUT
	BICYCLE ROUTE
	CVS BUS ROUTE

DRAFT