

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINTUES**

2 Wednesday, January 10th, 2024, 6:00 pm

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

5 To view the video recording of the meeting please visit the City's YouTube Channel found [HERE](#).

7 **HR. MIN. SEC.** in green are time stamps of the YouTube recording.

9 **Call to Order:** Michael Fortune

10 **Chair Roll Call of Commission Members:** Robert Henke, Brian Marble, Bob Washburn & Joe Chambers

11 **Members Absent:** Shelly Nazer

12 **Pledge of Allegiance:** Michael Fortune

15 **Approval of Minutes:** The Planning Commission will consider approval of the minutes for November 8th,
16 2023. ([MINUTES](#))

- 18 • Michael Fortune called for the approval of the minutes.
- 19 • Bob Washburn commented that he saw correction that were needed on line 23 & 24 which was to
20 correct Brian to Biran as was in the previous minutes; as well as on line 101 T-section should be T-
21 Intersection, in addition when talking about the issue, Skarlet had brought up the Standard and
22 Specifications Manual, noted that it should be included in the minutes and should have the whole title
23 which is 'Providence City Corporation Department of Public Work Standards and Specifications
24 Manual'. Also commented that on line 138 'view' should be 'overview'.

26 **Motion to stay approval until next meeting – Joe Chambers. 2nd – Brian Marble.**

27 **Vote:**

28 **Yea- Robert Henke, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune, Bob Washburn & Joe Chambers**

29 **Nay-**

30 **Abstained-**

31 **Absent- Shelly Nazer**

33 **Motion passes, minutes will be corrected and added to the next meeting's agenda for further review and
34 approval.**

36 **Public Comments:** Citizens may express their views on issues within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction.
37 The Commission accepts comments: in-person, by email providencecityutah@gmail.com , and
38 by text 435-752-9441. By law, email comments are considered public record and will be shared
39 with all parties involved, including the Planning Commission and the applicant.

- 41 • Michael Fortune opened the floor for public comments.
- 42 • Staff indicated that no comments had come in via text or email.
- 43 • No comments were made.
- 44 • Michael Fortune closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Study Items(s):

9 MIN 35 SEC.

- **Item No. 1 PCC Amendments regarding Sign Regulations:** The Providence City Planning Commission will review and discuss proposed changes to the city code regarding sign regulations.

(EXHIBIT)

- Michael Fortune called item 1, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an overview of the amendments.
- Skarlet Bankhead commented on a recent planning review with Chick-Fil-A and the current code regarding signs and how there is a section that doesn't allow signs on the highway to have lighting, which of course is an issue as signs with lights have been installed and utilized. Discussed with the Planning Commission sign lighting options and classifications. Indicated that the proposed amendments include stating the purpose of the chapter, adding clarification to the permitted sign table, adding a provision for inflatable signs, and adding an appeal process.
- Reviewed the banner blade sign definition and size limitations. Discussed the purpose of including this in the code and some of the issues that come with these kinds of signs.
- Michael Fortune commented on the Findings of Fact, the overall procedure for code reviews and amendments and that the next step is setting this item for a public hearing.
- Parties discussed what concerns there are for banner blade signs and if there are issues with them that can be addressed or corrected through the code; such as how its fixed or placed in the ground, guide wires or support, anchors etc.
- Parties discussed what happens if a party is in violation of the code or how violations are addressed by the city. Parties discussed enforcement of the code. Skarlet referenced PCC10-15-6(E) regarding public property restrictions.
- Bob Washburn commented on unsafe sign issues and if more restrictions need to be added, like with banner flags, as have been discussed. Ryan Snow commented on the Big O Tire signs as an example of safety issues with flag signs when pulling out on to the highway at that intersection.
- Parties discussed additional options for restrictions and traffic safety issues that some signs pose.
- Brian Marble asked if the chart was part of the city code. Mrs. Bankhead responded that it is part of the code.
- Joe Chambers asked if strobe lights should be addressed or added to the animated, flashing, intermittent signs section. Believes that section should be more detailed.
- Bob Washburn commented on park strip signs, walking or advertisement signs and some of the safety issues they pose. Parties talked about limiting the sign size as most of the time the people holding the signs are on sidewalk intersections and not outside the business building like they should be. Robert Henke commented that if they limit or change size regulations on one type of sign than they'll probably need to look or review all sign sizes and make changes.
- Brian Marble commented on issues and concerns he has with the Visionary sign that sits on Gateway Dr. Asked what type of sign it would be considered as and what regulation it should be following.

- 88 • Joe Chambers commented that with most regulations there can always be a work around. Robert
89 Henke asked about enforcement of these regulations. Skarlet Bankhead responded that they are
90 usually reviewed as part of the site plan review where staff look very closely at the plans to make
91 sure the plans are in compliance with code.
- 92 • Parties discussed how the code came about that restricted lighted signs on the highway. Mrs.
93 Bankhead responded that there is really no good reason for it to have passed and that it could
94 have just been a clerical error. Parties commented on making sure that part of the code was
95 corrected as it should be allowed. Talked about if there should be illumination restrictions.
- 96 • Parties discussed neon and fluorescent lights or signs.
- 97 • Parties commented on temporary sign timeframes and if they should be increased, decreased or if
98 there should be a renewal process.
- 99 • Parties began reviewing the permitted signs table. Brian Marble and Bob Washburn commented
100 and asked if the header of the table could be repeated somehow as it was difficult to review the
101 types of signs at the bottom of the table and have to scroll up to see what each column was or
102 represented.
- 103 • Robert Henke asked where the numbers for the signs, in terms of height and area come from.
104 Mrs. Bankhead indicated that most of the numbers come from google, other cities and what the
105 city currently uses such as A-frames.
- 106 • Parties discussed the difference between banner signs and banner blade signs.
- 107 • Parties reviewed the listed notes that are referenced in the table and found at the bottom of the
108 table.
- 109 • Joe Chambers asked about waiver or variances. Mrs. Bankhead responded that it is possible so
110 long as the applicant seeking a variance meets the criteria.
- 111 • Parties talked about flat signs and possible issues or concerns of signs that go above the building
112 line.
- 113 • Parties discussed roof signs, ground signs versus monument signs and making sure signs on the
114 highway are allowed to be illuminated. Parties discussed the definitions and guidelines for yard
115 signs, business signs, inflatable signs, low profile and off the premise signs.
- 116 • Parties discussed the definition of political signs and what constitutes a political sign and how
117 they are governed or regulated by the State. Parties commented on campaign signs and voting
118 signs. Joe Chambers gave an example of an issue he had with sign restrictions that he dealt with
119 when he was running for an election or office.
- 120 • Joe Chambers commented if there should be a statement in the code that addresses the issue of
121 when a sign qualifies for multiple definitions and which of the most or least restriction sign
122 regulations would take precedence. The Planning Commission agreed that it should be the least
123 restrictive definition so long as the sign would qualify.
- 124 • Parties discussed for sale signs, property signs and real-estate signs and if they are considered
125 temporary signs and would be subject to the removal timeframes. Brian Marble gave the
126 example of the Visionary Homes sign on Gateway Dr that has been there for some time and if
127 there would be a way to request that it be taken down.
- 128 • Ryan Snow commented on the city's nuisance ordinance and going through that ordinance to see
129 if some of these signs were considered a nuisance. Skarlet Bankhead referenced the maintenance

clause in the code. Parties discussed worn down signs that are still out there and have been out there for years and how to resolve the issue or get them taken down or even if they could based on what the code states.

- Parties continued discussion of the table commenting on temporary signs, large wind signs and banner signs versus flag signs.
- Joe Chambers asked his fellow Planning Commission members if this item was ready for a public hearing or to be continued out for further study. Parties agree that taking it to a public hearing would be best. Parties discussed potential dates for the public hearing.
- The Planning Commission commented and agreed not to meet on Wednesday February 14th as it would be Valentines Day. Public Hearing for this item will be set for February 28th.

2 HR. 04 MIN. 40 SEC.

- **Item No. 2 PCC Amendments regarding clear view areas and residential driveways:** The Providence City Planning Commission will review and discuss proposed changes to city code 10-9 that deals with clear view areas and residential driveways. **(EXHIBIT)**

- Michael Fortune called item 2, gave a brief introduction and asked Skarlet Bankhead to give an overview of the amendments.
- Skarlet Bankhead handed to the Planning Commission members a handout that showed a diagram of the proposed setback and clear view restrictions. Discussed with the Planning Commission the clear view triangle and tree canopy restrictions. Mrs. Bankhead noted that the setbacks are measured from the property line and the clear view triangle is 30' along the property line from the corner then extended to the street. Mrs. Bankhead discussed stop sign placements and curb and gutter variables and issues. Commented that she is seeing a potential problem with lots that become elevated as the owners bring in dirt to be able to build their homes.
- Mrs. Bankhead informed the Commission that this was one of the few codes that if or when passed would allow the city to resolve any past issues or areas, that nothing would be grandfathered into the code since this is a public safety issue.
- Brian Marble commented on how this would affect building envelopes.
- Parties discussed park strip measurements, sidewalk variables and issues with pedestrians needing to be able to see oncoming traffic. Parties also commented on driveways and making sure cars could back out safely.
- Planning Commission commented on the wide affect this would have on the city and its citizens. Relayed that this was no simple change and that these changes would affect a lot of people.
- Michale Fortune posed that maybe the Commission should take more time to review these changes and go out and see examples of where this would be implemented.
- Parties discussed the old code and the current code or proposed changes. Staff comment on tree diameter restrictions and stop sign placements and procedures to get those in place. Asked the Planning Commission to look at these changes from a public safety perspective or point of view.
- Brian Marble commented on issues with blanket laws, tree restrictions and the cutting down of tress and what the city charter has to say about it.

- Joe Chambers commented on tabling this item to allow them more time to study it.
- Parties discussed the Planning Commission duties, purpose and responsibilities.
Joe Chambers leaves the meeting
- Commission discussed the recommendations they make to the City Council and the city's general plan. Staff comment on the 6 key initiatives that should help guide their purpose and decision making.
- Michael Fortune asked what the primary purpose was for this code change. Staff responded that it is a public safety issue. Brian Marble asked if there is proof, reports or stats that show the need for such changes.
- Michael Fortune commented on the importance of these changes and making sure they get it right as it will very much impact the city.
- Skarlet Bankhead commented on the many complaints she gets about big trees blocking views and the problems they cause to traffic and walking pedestrians.
- The Planning Commission agrees to table this item for further discussion until they meet again.

Motion to adjourn meeting – Brian Marble. 2nd – Bob Washburn.

Vote:

Yea- Robert Henke, Brian Marble, Michael Fortune & Bob Washburn.


Nay-

Abstained-

Absent- Shelly Nazer & Joe Chambers.

Minutes approved by vote of Planning Commission on 24th day of January 2024.


Michael Fortune, Chair


Ty Cameron, City Recorder