



**Minutes of the North Logan City
Planning Commission
Held on February 20, 2025
At the North Logan City Offices, North Logan, Utah**

(0:00:00 - Time stamps throughout the minutes below, indicate the time an item begins in the recording of the meeting.)

The meeting was called to order by Nan Isaacson at 6:30 p.m.

Commission members present were: Nan Isaacson, Heather Ericson, Gavin Payne, Teresa Theurer, Tracy Walker, and Porter Wilkins.

Others present were: Alan Luce, Scott Perkes, Jordan Oldham, Susan Smart, Bill Tolbert, Tim Tolbert, Dianna Cannell, Michael Sampson, Marie Sampson, Johannah Cox, Cami Cox, Tucker Hood, Russell Goodwin, and Mark Hancey.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Tracy Walker
An invocation was given by Gavin Payne

(0:01:35)

Adoption of Agenda

Motion

Teresa Theurer made a motion to adopt the agenda, as presented. Gavin Payne seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with Nan Isaacson, Heather Ericson, Gavin Payne, Teresa Theurer, and Tracy Walker voting in favor.

(0:01:51)

Approval and Follow-up of Minutes for the February 6, 2024 Planning Commission

Meeting.

Motion

Gavin Payne made a motion to approve the minutes, as presented. Tracy Walker seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with Nan Isaacson, Heather Ericson, Gavin Payne, Teresa Theurer, and Tracy Walker voting in favor.

(0:02:10)

Follow-up

Scott Perkes provided updates on:

- **General Plan and the City Center Master plan:** the City Council approved both plans, along with an addition regarding the emphasis of needing individual ownership of housing. Thanks to the Planning Commission for all their hard work. He also provided an update regarding the contracting with Downtown Development Services to carry forward the City Center Plan to develop the form-based code, and to fully implement the Plan, including working with all of the property owners in the City Center. There will also be an RFP to attract a developer for the City Center.
- **Subdivisions, including Village Springs and Sage Hills.** Village Springs Project, a 55+ project near Wolfpack Way is progressing and awaiting the preliminary plan submission. Sage Hills is potentially going to work with Sierra Homes to carry the development forward.

New Business

Regular Commission Business:

(0:07:27)

Item # 1: PUBLIC HEARING and potential recommendation regarding an application for Zoning Map Amendment (rezone) to upzone the current zoning classification of Parcel ID: 07-118-0005 (2510 N 800 E) from its current classification of RE-1 (Residential Estate - 1 Acre) to R-1-20 (Single-Family Residential - 20,000 sq.ft.)

Scott Perkes provided an overview regarding this agenda item. This is a proposed upzone from RE-1 to R-1-20. This area of town is in a transitional location for zoning. Susan's lot is one acre in size, and a rezone would enable her to subdivide into two total lots. Scott described the surrounding zoning. The area to the North is one acre, to the south is half acre, and to the west is R-1-12. Scott went over the similarities between R-1-20, and RE-1. Scott discussed the latest updates from the new General Plan and how they are applicable to this site, and what quadrant this is located in. Scott described the general areas of zoning across the City, and where infill could take place. Scott provided an overview of the types of homes that are common in this part of the City. Residential core district 2 is the land use type for this area that has opportunities for infill, but it is intended to match the surrounding housing types and zoning. One highlight Scott provided was regarding design and the emphasis in the General Plan of having similarity in design. Normally, cities cannot mandate a particular design, however, with a re-zone request, the City can impose conditions regarding design on a re-zoned lot. Scott further described how the applicant's home fits within Residential Core District 2, and how it fits with the opportunities for infill. Scott mentioned that the staff has given a positive recommendation for this rezone request.

Nan Isaacson asked about an existing building in the applicant, Susan Smart's, backyard. Scott described that there is an existing accessory building that could affect a future lot line.

(0:16:14)

At 6:49pm Nan Isaacson opened up the meeting for public input.

Tim Tolbert: commented on the zoning map and that this property should be rezoned to R-1-12, and a rezone of R-1-20 is reasonable. Tim mentioned the City threatened eminent domain on this property, and also mentioned he was upset regarding the subjectivity in the General Plan.

Dianna Cannell: expressed her concern regarding this potential spot re-zone and what type of precedent this would set for the surrounding areas. She mentioned her concern regarding safety with an additional driveway near a new roundabout.

Michael Sampson: stated he opposed this rezone and that he grew up near this area wanted the same flavor of land use as what he grew up with.

Bill Tolbert (spoke on behalf of Susan Smart, applicant): talked about Susan's legacy on the property that she built in 1975, and has maintained her lot for 50 years. Susan served the community for 25 years as a member of dispatch. Susan now has difficulty maintaining her entire property and would now like to split off her property to help with these difficulties. He also was glad to hear about the staff report on infill opportunities.

Susan Smart: mentioned that she moved here in 1975 and bought ten acres and has loved living there. She went through a divorce, and has had unexpected adventures associated with age including high medical costs. She has maintained her investment for 50 years, her kids don't live nearby but have talked about coming home, and labor and workers to maintain property is hard to pay for. She talked about the elderly who have died from similar diseases, and that her land is well fertilized for a lawn and ready for a lovely home.

At 7:00pm Nan Isaacson closed the public hearing and opened up the dialogue to the Planning Commission.

108
109 Gavin Payne commented about the corner of 2500N 800E and the amount of land that would be
110 needed for the roundabout. Scott showed the sliver (74 square feet) of Susan's property that
111 would be needed. Gavin asked if the request to split the land was made by Susan. Scott
112 explained that the roundabout was the impetus for this request by Susan Smart to re-zone her
113 property. Scott talked about the access and future driveway into Susan's existing home. Scott
114 mentioned that this sliver of Susan's land was not purchased using eminent domain.

115
116 Porter asked if the City would use a similar approach of compensating for property in multiple
117 ways for any other roundabout. Scott confirmed this.

118
119 Tracy Walker asked what the future intent of the property is. Scott described that in the future, if
120 the property is rezoned, they could subdivide the property into two lots.

121
122 Teresa Theurer mentioned that she loves roundabouts. She said that Susan's lot is half on a
123 major street, so she is supportive of this roundabout and the re-zone request because of the
124 depth of the lot.

125
126 Nan Isaacson asked whether this re-zone would have a precedent for the surrounding lots. And
127 Scott confirmed that it would not and the other residents would have to make a similar request.

128
129 Gavin Payne mentioned he was sympathetic to the Cannell's concerns, and expressed that this
130 property is in the Core 2 District and fits the goals of the district interface with the zoning.

131
132 Scott mentioned that the districts don't have specific zoning. But that the residential cores of the
133 General Plan get less dense as you go North and East in the City. Residential core 3 and 2
134 mention the opportunities for infill and selective slightly higher zoning, but no zoning classification
135 with each land use.

136
137 Gavin stated the property to the south of the subject property is R-1-20 and to the west is R-1-12.

138
139 Nan Isaacson mentioned that because of where this property is located and language in the
140 code, the City has some discretion in the design of a potential home, and asked if that should be
141 something that they should consider if they send it forward to the City Council.

142
143 Scott mentioned that this is the case. Scott also mentioned that the Cannell's to the east have
144 put a lot of money into the redesign of their home and they want to preserve that investment.
145 This could be done through a development agreement with specific design requirements for a
146 prospective lot on Susan's property.

147
148 Nan wanted the Planning Commission to be able to make those recommendations regarding
149 design if they forwarded this to the Council. Nan mentioned that the roundabout shouldn't affect
150 Susan's safety and the City would work with her on her driveway.

151
152 Gavin asked if there are any design requirements in the code. Scott mentioned this action,
153 requiring legislative action for a zone change and increasing density, then we do have that
154 discretion.

155
156 Heather Ericson mentioned that all of the homes vary in size and style on this corridor.

157
158 Gavin Payne discussed what could be done with ADU's on this property; and said he was
159 sympathetic to the landowner, and he likes roundabouts and feels they increase safety.

160
161 Heather Ericson said that she is a big fan of a roundabout, and is in favor of the rezone because
162 it would fit the neighborhood.

163
164 Porter Wilkins was wondering if there were any specific design guidelines available. Scott said

there weren't and that the design criteria would need to be developed with some latitude.

Porter mentioned that they should focus on the quality of home and not size.

Tracy asked if they should step back and review this item before making a decision.

Scott mentioned that one of the items that the City needs to develop is an incentive for proper infill that doesn't create weird shaped lots in the future, or flag lots. This could be done in the future with an ordinance. However, this ordinance wouldn't really affect this particular property. Susan's property is a good candidate for infill. This core anticipates a small uptick in density.

Dianna Cannell mentioned that she would love to purchase the property from Susan and add it as greenspace to her property. Scott mentioned that the only way to create a parcel to sell to Dianna is through this process because Susan's existing home would be on a non-conforming if they did not go through the re-zone and subdivision process.

Scott reminded the Planning Commission that financial implications don't have merit in these decisions.

(0:52:42)

Motion at 7:05pm

Gavin Payne made a motion to table this item until a list of design criteria can be developed.

Tracy Walker seconded the motion.

Further discussion ensued. Porter Wilkins asked if they could make a positive recommendation regarding a rezone and have the design standards to be determined by the City Council. Heather asked what public opinion could be provided at that time. Scott Perkes stated that the public could provide comment and input at any time between today and the next City Council. Porter Wilkins said that he is in favor of this rezone and that design conditions be put in place. Nan asked if the conditions run with the land and Scott confirmed that.

Nan Isaacson called for a vote on the motion. Gavin Payne and Tracy Walker voted in favor of Gavin's original motion, while Teresa Theurer, Nan Isaacson, Porter Wilkins, and Heather Ericson voted nay. The motion failed to carry.

Teresa made a motion to accept the rezone application from Susan Smart with the conditions, facts, and findings from City staff, along with a condition that design criteria for a potential home, on the prospective second lot on Susan's property, be created and presented before the City Council for their consideration. The design criteria would also need to be memorialized via development agreement for a future home if the rezone is approved by the City Council. Heather seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with Nan Isaacson, Heather Ericson, Gavin Payne, Teresa Theurer, and Tracy Walker voting in favor.

(1:00:00)

Item #2: Work Session - Review and discussion regarding draft zoning text amendments to NLMC Sections 12A & 12B intended to begin implementing the goals and policies contained within the recently adopted 2025 General Plan

Scott Perkes discussed the implementation process for the General Plan and the City Center Plan. He discussed a hypothetical schedule for the code update and policy updates. The City's contractor would update those items working with the Planning Commission. Scott then went over the items in Sections 12A and 12B.

- 12A goes over the authority of the code, the land use ordinance and subdivision ordinance that is adopted by the City Council, and also goes over the purpose of the land use ordinance. 12A also talks about advisory guides including the associated master plans, guidelines and checklists, permits, and definitions.

- 12B discusses administration and the structure of that administration, staff processes, appeals authority, and the land use authority regulations. 12B changes discusses how this will flow in a logical progression and order.

Porter Wilkins mentioned that 12B provides several new processes and that seemed burdensome, especially for the staff.

Scott mentioned that all of these processes were already existing and also required by the State. Scott discussed updates from the State, including the fact that the City Council was not involved in several land use processes.

Gavin asked if a process code could be developed outside the ordinance. Scott mentioned he could run that past the City Attorney to see what should be included in the ordinance. Gavin said that he didn't want to hide anything from the public, but he wanted to help clarify the document if it is possible to clean up the document.

Scott mentioned that a discussion with the consultant was to decide how much content would need to be submitted to the public before moving forward. They didn't want too much at one time, but they also didn't want to do the process in a piecemeal process. After several public hearings throughout the process, at the process end there would be an ordinance to adopt.

Gavin would like to mention how many public hearings are involved, and that the process should go through it in sections.

Scott mentioned they would do several public hearings but that they wouldn't adopt the document by ordinance until the very end.

Tracy mentioned the importance of the need to for the public hearings and clarity in the process.

Scott mentioned that there would be a separate process and project for the form-based code for the City Center.

Scott encouraged the Planning Commission to use the google docs to make comments at any time throughout the process.

(1:17:54)

Staff Business:

Staff Business/Discussion

Scott mentioned the spring APA Conference in May 7-9, 2025 in Logan, UT. He encouraged the Planning Commission to register and attend this conference. The hours at this conference will go towards their required training and education hours.

Planning Commissioner Business/Discussion

None

Set Next Agenda (3/6/2025) and/or Adjourn

(1:19:26)

Motion

Gavin Payne made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Teresa Theurer seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously with Nan Isaacson, Heather Ericson, Gavin Payne, Teresa Theurer, and Tracy Walker voting in favor.

277 The meeting adjourned at: 7:52pm

278

279

280 Approved by Planning Commission:

March 20, 2025

281

282 Transcribed by: Alan Luce

283

284 Recorded by:

285

286



Scott Bennett/City Recorder
